Accn No. 22345
15.3.58

DATE LABEL

Nov 6 17.66	2/66		
10			
17/179			
22345			

Call No. 370 , P258 6 Date 15.3.58

Account No. 22345

J. & K. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

This book should be returned on or before the last stamped above. An overdue charges of 6 nP. will be levied for each day the book is kept beyond that day.

EDUCATIONAL ISSUES OF TO-DAY

Edited by W. R. Niblett

Professor of Education
University of Leeds

GROWING UP IN A MODERN SOCIETY

EDUCATIONAL ISSUES OF TO-DAY
Edited by W. R. Niblett

EDUCATION—CHRISTIAN OR PAGAN
by M. V. C. Jeffreys

GROWING UP IN A MODERN SOCIETY
by Marjorie E. Reeves

EDUCATION AND CRISIS
by B. A. Fletcher

ESSENTIAL EDUCATION
by W. R. Niblett

FREEDOM IN THE EDUCATIVE SOCIETY
by F. Clarke

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO-DAY
by J. F. Wolfenden

THE TEACHER IN A PLANNED SOCIETY
by R. W. Rich

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS LTD.

GROWING UP IN A MODERN SOCIETY

By

MARJORIE REEVES

"I call therefore a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."

JOHN MILTON.

ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY
22345
22345
15-B-58

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS LTD.
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.4

Education

FIRST PRINTED 1946
SECOND EDITION 1949
THIRD EDITION 1952

AGENTS OVERSEAS

AUSTRALIA
(and its Dependencies)
W. S. SMART — P.O. Box 120, SYDNEY, N.S.W.
Showroom: 558, George Street.

CANADA
CLARKE, IRWIN & CO., LTD.,
103, St. Clair Avenue West, TORONTO, 5.

EGYPT AND THE SUDAN
DINO JUDAH NAHUM — P.O. Box 940, CAIRO.
Showroom: 44, Sharia Sherif Pasha.

FAR EAST
(including China and Japan)
DONALD MOORE — Oldham Hall, SINGAPORE, 9.

INDIA, PAKISTAN, BURMA AND CEYLON
ORIENT LONGMANS, LTD.,
BOMBAY: Nicol Road, Ballard Estate.
CALCUTTA: 17, Chittaranjan Ave.
MADRAS: 36A, Mount Road.

NEW ZEALAND
(and its Dependencies)
R. J. SARE — 41, Shortland Street, AUCKLAND, C.1.

SOUTH AFRICA
H. B. TIMMINS — P.O. Box 94, CAPE TOWN.
Showroom: 58–60, Long Street.

370
R259G

Printed & Bound in England for the UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS LTD.,
by HAZELL, WATSON & VINEY, LTD., Aylesbury and London

EDITOR'S NOTE

THIS series of books is intended to help readers to explore further some of the great educational issues of our time. The organisation of education in this country is changing as we watch, and during the next few years vast developments in educational practice are inevitable.

It is the conviction of the contributors to this series, first, that education is a far more complex and deep-reaching affair than instruction; second, that what is taught and how we teach it necessarily reflect the beliefs we hold and our assumptions about life and what it is for; third, that the direction in which civilisation develops as the century goes on must in great measure depend upon the integrity, quality, and creativeness with which the individual is enabled to live in an increasingly planned society; and, lastly, that Christianity has insights to offer for which there is no substitute.

It is hoped that each book in the series, whether it treats a more general or a more particular issue, will, by challenging some generally accepted assumptions, have a contribution to make not only to thought, but to actual practice. There are no practices which do not in fact imply a philosophy of life, however little they may be conscious of doing so.

W. R. N.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	PREFACE	7
CHAPTER		
I.	WHO ARE THE EDUCATORS OF THE YOUNG?	9
II.	THE GROUP AND THE INDIVIDUAL	19
III.	THE MARKS OF TRUE COMMUNITY	34
IV.	THE PATTERN OF SOCIETIES—I	48
V.	THE PATTERN OF SOCIETIES—II	70
VI.	YOUNG PEOPLE IN A MASS SOCIETY	86
VII.	CREATING COMMUNITY	101

PREFACE

THIS book is written from the point of view of an amateur —a fact that will be at once detected by those who possess the *expertise* appropriate for one or other of the many fields of education into which it ventures. But then, its main contention is that education—the whole of education—*ought* to be the concern of amateurs, in the sense that it is an activity proper to all responsible adults in the community. The price we have paid for the development of an elaborate system of professional education has been the loss of that consciousness which seems to be inherent in simpler societies, that education is a natural function of the ordinary adult, the youth being brought up beside the man. This consciousness we must recover. It is time, therefore, that we invaded the holy places of education, threw open the windows, and let everyone in. Teaching is not a mysterious rite whose low-chanted formulæ are known only to acolytes unmistakably distinguished from ordinary folk by the badges or marks of their office (in the words of a Glasgow bus conductor: "dour faces, wee battered cases and a bunch o' flowers"). There can hardly be a more universal human activity than this of the more mature instructing and guiding the less mature. Technical aspects of education there must always be, but let us not lock up all urgent and vital thought about education in a tidy professional preserve.

One further comment must be made here. It is fatally easy to turn for salvation to some *deus ex machina*. Such hopes have been focused on the Education Act of 1944. Already disillusionment is setting in, and inevitably so, for we shall never get an educational Utopia through any Act of Parliament. But the error goes deeper than this:

we expect education to make new men and women. This it can never do. The young may be—and must be—properly fed in body, mind and spirit, the doors of opportunity may be opened wide for them, *but still the power of moral choice is theirs alone*: they may enter into the promised land, but they may turn back again to sloth and feebleness, or enter a world of their own creating, with themselves enthroned in the centre; thus they may turn their faces from the *real* world of experience which God gives to Man. The two temptations, sloth and pride (or self-centredness), pull at every man's heels, and education alone can never remove them, for salvation is from above. We must, therefore, begin our educational thinking with a clear recognition of the limits of education, as well as of the wide scope of its responsibilities.

MARJORIE REEVES.

OXFORD,
October, 1945.

NOTE TO THE THIRD EDITION

THE mood of 1952 is very different from that of 1945. Many of the things we then looked for hopefully are now deferred. But our principles and aims in education remain broadly the same, and the young we have always with us. We must give all we have to meet the insistent claims of the present, and not let hope deferred make the heart too sick to strive for the future.

M. E. R.

OXFORD,
April, 1952.

CHAPTER I

WHO ARE THE EDUCATORS OF THE YOUNG?

The paradox of education lies in the fact that the process of growing up is at once intensely personal, yet essentially social. Each person is, as it were, the centre of his own circle of awareness: his growth is the process of widening this circle by assimilating fresh things, people, experiences into his awareness. No two people have quite the same experience, and therefore no two people ever have quite the same education. A baby, kicking upon the rug in front of the fire, is perhaps aware only of warmth, firelight, movement of limbs; he does not, as yet, even know himself as distinct from the rest of his world, but from the first his experience is his own, and day by day, as impressions pour in upon him, his narrow circle is enlarged, and his education proceeds. But each fresh impression must knock and gain admittance in his consciousness: the citadel within is his own.

Each child is, therefore, the centre of his own circle. If the world he had to assimilate consisted entirely of *things*, his education would be simple. He bumps himself and takes in the property of wood or stone; he eats coal and pours water and slaps his pudding, and so learns what these things do and what he can do with them. But far more difficult and important is his growing awareness of *persons*. These he cannot understand by eating or chewing or slapping, though at first he tries to. He cannot appropriate them or make them part of himself, for he finds in them a mysterious quality of 'otherness' which forbids him to use them like wood or stone. He can only

meet them face to face. This is much more difficult to do, but much more worth while, for—and here lies the paradox—though each one of us is the centre of his own circle of awareness, our most vivid and illuminating experiences are those in which we meet, as it were on the circumference of that circle, another person.

The meaning of this fundamental education through relations has been worked out by Martin Buber in his remarkable book *I and Thou*.[1] There are, he maintains, two primary words, signifying the two primary relations: I–Thou and I–It. These combinations precede any consciousness of I as an entity standing alone, for 'in the beginning is relation'. The primary word I–It can *never* be spoken with the whole being. The primary word I–Thou can *only* be spoken with the whole being. The Thou meets me through grace—it can never be found by seeking. But my speaking of the primary word to it is an act of my being, is, indeed, *the* act of my being. I become through my relation to the Thou; as I become I, I say Thou. All real life is meeting.

Our education consists of contacts with things and persons, but contacts with persons are the most significant, for persons grow above all through personal relations. Impressions of things and persons constantly mingle, of course. A child's experience of a hard bump is inextricably mixed up with the sensation of being comforted by someone. Our knowledge of things is shot through by our experience of persons. Every book is a gateway into a realm of knowledge through someone else's mind, through his particular selection and interpretation of information, and frequently a passion for some branch of knowledge, which may become a life-long pursuit—archæology, bird-watching, astronomy, stamp-collecting—is first kindled by another enthusiast. The discipline of 'stubbing one's toes against hard facts' is, of course, an important part of education, but much,

[1] Trans. by R. Gregor Smith (1937).

though by no means all, of our knowledge of things is mediated through the minds of persons, taking colour and significance from those who communicate them. This is an unpalatable truth to those who stress what they call 'objectivity' in education, but it remains true that human growth is achieved through the impact of person on person. It is just possible to conceive of solitary education on a desert island, in which the impact of things is experienced without any interpretation by people, books or art. But such education could hardly be called human, for the essence of this is experience lit up and interpreted by living contacts with people. Education is supremely a social, not a solitary, process.

We must think, therefore, not of isolated individuals developing, as it were, *in vacuo,* but of *children set in societies,* living within the framework of the various groups in whose life they are nurtured. The problem is one of educative communities, and the purpose of this book is to look at the different groups or societies concerned in the upbringing of children and to consider some of the problems of their educational function.

If education is considered as a process of growing up within the life of a group, it is immediately clear that this goes on all the time. It would be so much simpler for the adult members of a community if this were not so! If only the grown-ups could say: 'Take heed of these weighty words, and learn by those edifying experiences, but shut your ears and eyes to all ill-considered utterances and happenings when Papa is off-duty!' But the fact is that children are assimilating impressions throughout their waking hours, and no wise adult can determine just what they shall admit from the outside, for they alone are the doorkeepers. The adult members of a community can, of course, make a careful selection of knowledge and experience, and decree that thus and thus it shall be taught to our young. This considered and selected part of education,

which we call schooling, is naturally of great importance, for those things which a community, through its consciously-framed educational policy, chooses to teach to its young represent, or should represent, that accumulation of wisdom which it wishes to pass on to the next generation. But education can never be limited to schooling, that is, to certain experiences or information given at certain specific times under certain chosen teachers. For it consists both of 'selected' and 'unselected' experiences, and in many ways the latter are the most fundamental in their effects. Johnnie, following his father down the garden with the same gait and the same pauses to spit, is a parable of education, for just as children imitate adults in mannerisms caught when they are off-guard, so they assimilate, not what the grown-up intends, but qualities and attitudes which are of the real essence of the person. It is the total life of an adult, not what he pretends to be in his consciously educating moments, which really influences the young, and equally it is the total life of a community, not merely its avowed ideals, which educates its younger members. No Education Act, however nobly designed, can really achieve much if it conflicts with the values implicit in the common life of the community.

If, then, we ask 'Who are the educators of the young?' the answer is plain: all the adults in the community. Try as we will, we can never really foist this responsibility on to the professional teacher class. Children are being educated the whole day long, by all those, both contemporary and older, whom they meet. Their educators are legion: members of the family, playmates, people in the streets, shop-folk, workmen at their jobs, and, later, fellow-workers in factory, office, or field, and behind all these the general life of the community as expressed in its houses and shops, its industries and traffic, its advertisements, newspapers and cinemas. Through a thousand voices these speak to the young: ultimately the whole community is the educa-

tor of its young, and it cannot divest itself of this responsibility by devising the most perfect scheme of schooling to be contained safely within the four walls of a school-building.

The relative importance of education inside and outside school varies, of course, both with the individual and with the type of school. Some children are held very closely within the special life of the school society, notably in the case of boarding-schools. Yet Edward Wilson, the Antarctic explorer, probably received his most important education in the woods and hills above his Cheltenham school,[1] and many would say with a famous writer: "My education was interrupted by my schooling." As for the East End child, worming his way through dense little market streets, or hanging round great docks, what can compete in vivid impression with the quick-changing variegated scenes before him?

In an evacuation survey made in Oxford,[2] essays written on 'What I like most in Oxford and what I miss in Oxford' showed clearly that foremost in the recollections of these Poplar children were, first, father and mother, and second, the life of London streets.

> "I miss the noise and bustle of London. . . . No newspaper boys running about the streets shouting the names of the papers. No open-markets with the stall-keepers shouting out how good their vegetables, fish or toys are."
>
> "I miss the factory's hooter that screams through the dusty air. I also miss the rumbling of trains, thundering through the station at top speed, sending smoke all over the place. I also miss the hooting of ships and tugs chugging along the river Thames pulling a ship that is going over sea."

[1] Seaver, *Edward Wilson of the Antarctic* (1933), p. 9.
[2] Oxford Evacuation Survey, unpublished, but available at Barnett House, Oxford.

Others mention the man who sells baked potatoes, the milkman's horse, the cries of 'old iron', the stool-maker's shouting, the soap-sellers who clean carpets, the 'hustle and bresstle [*sic*] of the shoppers and workers', 'the man with the ox-drawn cart who comes every Wednesday and used to bring the meat and a lot of fuss, the man would stop outside the slaughterhouse and the oxen would try to stampede.' How little these East London street figures, in all probability, are aware of the small absorbed persons who stand in the midst of the hubbub so intently taking in everything!

Just how successfully do the selected experiences which we give children in our schools compete with what goes on outside? We do not ask this question with nearly sufficient insistence, for the assumption is far too often that the forty children sitting so placidly in rows at school are forty uniform and empty containers waiting to be filled with a standard educational mixture. And when we do ask it, the trouble is that we have so little data upon which to build an answer. We have information in one compartment on health, in another on school conduct and achievement, and possibly in another on psychological difficulties or delinquencies; parents, club leaders, Sunday-school teachers would be able to supply other pieces in the puzzle, but who has anything approaching a complete picture of the child's life, or of the way in which he fits his varying experiences together into a whole? We departmentalise him so much that no one person has any real conception of his total education, with all his experiences, selected and unselected, seen in relation to each other. Perhaps no one person should, but it is of vital importance that professional educators should recognise that in approaching any one child they approach a creature of extremely complex experience, which is unlike anybody else's and *which has been added to since the teacher saw him yesterday*. Although he may, to a certain extent, live

two lives, and pick up the school thread where he dropped it yesterday, fundamentally he must meet his school situations in the light of his total experience, and therefore the clue to his behaviour in school lies probably, not in his past record there at all, but in some happening outside of which the school takes no cognizance.

Thus, one of the chief problems of schooling arises from the fact that it cannot, and should not, be sealed off from the rest of a child's education. This makes it infinitely more complex. In a single class, to be handled as one unit, one child's mind may be in a whirl because of the quarrel his father had last night with his mother; another may be secretly brooding over the death next door, with all its gruesome details; a third may be far away in the film seen last night. One child is excited and absorbed by all his school activities—and gets a good report: his next-door neighbour is labelled lazy, or a dreamer, but half an hour after school is over you may find him standing as close as he dare to the road-menders, utterly intent upon the absorbing business of drilling and tarring. He is learning now, with a vengeance—taking in everything, from the way the workmen talk and spit to what it looks like underneath the road when you dig a hole. For so many children in a big city the gutter is far the most exciting place of education: first there are such fascinating things to be found in it; then there are the regular people who come and go to be studied and copied; then the traffic and business of the street claims attention, with incidents galore providing every kind of excitement; street gangs form, street games are devised, and the child becomes part of a moving, exciting life that may well claim more of his vitality and attention than his classroom life at school. Again, the war was a powerful educating force, as witness the posses of small boys who ran around rat-tat-tatting like machine-guns. And, finally, as boys and girls approach the school-leaving age, inevitably their minds are

absorbed in the business of choosing, and imagining themselves inside, their first jobs, so that their most powerful educators at this moment are probably the friends who left the term before and whom they so desperately want to copy in clothes, make-up and manners. With classes at their present size, how seldom is it possible for the teacher to be really aware of the bewildering variety of experience and interest upon which he tries to graft the learning of the schools!

The crux of this whole process of education is the way in which the growing person adjusts himself to the wealth of outside experience pouring in upon him. He is called continually to the effort of making a true response, that is, of opening his heart and mind fearlessly to the new. In this process he has to separate the true from the false, to embrace the truth unswervingly, and finally to rethink his knowledge of himself in the light of this new experience. Of all tasks, this is the most exacting—to see oneself justly—neither too big nor too small, but *justly*—in relation to things and persons outside oneself. On the one hand, there is the danger that experience, breaking in tumultuous waves, will submerge the self, and sweep the child from his moorings; on the other hand, there lies the strong temptation to raise barricades against new and disturbing forces, fortifying the self by an enhanced esteem. As so often in education, true growth depends on two opposite conditions: an outgoingness of spirit, ready and eager for adventure and experiment; yet a definite status in a firmly established position which forms a point of departure. One must start exploring from a given base, and one must return to this home base sometimes. Confidence to adventure and to admit new experience seems to depend on two things—the security engendered by 'belonging somewhere' and the degree to which experience is interpreted to make sense. The adolescent who faces his expanding world with most confidence is not, as a rule, the child who at an

early age had to fend for himself in a hostile or indifferent world, but rather the one who grew up secure in an assured place of love, and found guides at hand to interpret new experiences as they came to him. An equally significant fact about human beings is that, for true living, their experience must manifest a recognisable order, in obedience to intelligible laws and purposes, and in the midst of this ordered experience each individual must see his own meaning in relation to the whole. He must find his right place in an expanding and purposive world to which he opens his heart and mind.

The most damaging and uneducational experiences for the young are, therefore, in the first place, those which deny them an assured position of love and security from which to start, and secondly, those which give a sense of chaos, unreliability, or meaninglessness. A confusion of hurrying people without any discernible order or purpose can terrify and cow the individual, as he stands, for example, in a great London railway terminus, or at Piccadilly Circus. Sheer hugeness paralyses him, and so stunts personal growth. Again, an Alice-through-the-looking-glass kind of life is very exciting for an afternoon's adventure, but it is an almost exact antithesis of true education, for it gives the experience of a topsy-turvy world which disobeys its own laws, and is characterised by unreliability in people and circumstances. Surprise, of course, must give a tang to life, but not to be able to count on things happening in a certain known way breeds a fear which destroys all delight in the unexpected.

Conversely, certain experiences are vital in education: that of belonging within a society which gives a stable framework of law and order; of meeting reliability or trustworthiness in the human beings who exercise control; of growing up within groups of persons which are not too large to be 'humanly assimilable'; of finding within these groups a significant personal part to play in the service of

common purposes. To achieve this the group must, above all, be small enough for the members to meet each other face to face, and to grow slowly in mutual understanding. For education at its deepest level means the understanding of other persons as those whom one may not seek to exploit, dominate, or possess, but with whom one may hold communion, and find therein the richest experience of life. Persons cannot be known in this way either when they are manipulated as parts of a machine or when they are swept along in the mass that follows the fashion or the leader. Not that there is anything intrinsically wrong in manipulating or forming part of an intricate human organisation, nor yet again in joining or leading a great mass movement. Both can give exhilarating experience, but neither can be a true substitute for the basic experience of growing slowly in the knowledge of oneself and of others, through the life of a group small enough for every member to taste, as it were, the peculiar flavour of each of the others. It is within such circles that human beings find themselves as they discover others, building up their self-knowledge and confidence as they find value in the eyes of their fellows, discovering their own powers as they are called forth in social situations. Each one of us needs such a society, even if it be only the group of boon companions for whom we tell our best jokes or cut our best capers. Especially for the young in adolescence is the formation of true groups important, at the moment when, being most uncertain of their status, they need to discover themselves as people of value in the eyes of others.

Thus it is hopeless to think of large units—the great city, the educational institution a thousand strong, the great Palace of Youth—if we are considering real educational processes. If these large units are inevitable it is essential that we should break them up into the kind of societies in which human beings can grow in confidence, significance and purpose. The neighbourhood group, the

small classroom unit, the discussion group are far more potent than mass institutions. In the midst of all the war-time massing of men one significant feature was the out-cropping of spontaneous little societies—street groups, A.R.P. social groups, discussion groups in the Forces, and so forth. Here was the real social impulse in operation as against the depersonalising experience of vast agglomerations of people. This is always at work in the young. As they grow, so they form their street gangs and societies. A group of boys came lately to a Youth Organiser and said: "We are a club. We meet round a lamp-post. We want a room, but we don't want a leader." Many of us can recall the intricacies of the secret societies we ran, with their rules, rituals and symbols. Perhaps the impulse to form a society is seen at its simplest in the following story. A little girl, sent to bed, wept much, saying: "I can't think what my soci. would say if it could see me lying here." "Oh," said the teacher, "so you've got a society. Who belongs to it?" "Just self and friend." When we get down to self and friend we have certainly reached one of the basic educational units.

CHAPTER II

THE GROUP AND THE INDIVIDUAL

WHAT is the intention of the community towards its young? This is one of the most important questions which can be asked of any group or State, for by what it does with those most in its power—the young, the old, the lunatic, the criminal—the civilisation of a régime can best be judged. Generally speaking, the adult generation seeks to impart its skills and social habits, its experience and accumulated knowledge, its traditions and its beliefs, to the next generation. In some sense, therefore, there must always be com-

munity education. But *how* does the group use its power over the growing individuals? Does it seek to mould the young into certain types, training them to fulfil specific functions in a given pattern and to accept without question traditional social standards and beliefs? Or—at the other extreme—does it aim at bringing up individuals without any given context, free from the bias of any inherited faith or standards, and able to create their own patterns? Or does it aim at something between these two?

The formulation of these questions shows, I think, the age-long, though often unrealised, tension which exists in education between the community and the individual. The need of the community to breed up for itself sons who will fit into the traditional way of life stands perpetually over against the claim of the individual to create his own design and shape his own ends. It is instructive to trace this tension in the history of education and to observe, broadly, how the pendulum swings from one side to the other. Here it is only possible to illustrate this theme very briefly.

Education among primitive peoples represented the attempt of the tribe to condition its young for entry into a life governed by age-long customs and taboos. Practical skills and knowledge were taught by adults, but the most important part of education was probably expressed in story, song and dance, and, finally, in the initiation ceremonies of adolescence. Thus, for Papuan boys, in quite recent times, the course of instruction in the men's house at initiation formed a training in tribal custom. So the individual entered into the social habits, morality and beliefs of the tribe, receiving his purposes ready-made from his society. The ritual character of much of this education meant that the appeal was primarily to the emotions rather than to the intellect. Thus, to take as an example a primitive element in Greek education, the boy who danced the dance of Dionysos felt in his bones the truth of the myth of

Acc No: 22345

life that is crushed to rise again. If we may define 'religious education' as nurture in a faith and way of life, then from the outset education was essentially religious, and it was vitally important to the community that it should be so. For the life of the tribe was more than that of the individuals in it, who were, indeed, hardly recognised as separate beings at all. The highest interests of the tribe were expressed in its moral and religious laws: therefore the young must be conditioned to accept these and so carry on the life of the tribe. When adaptation or change was forced upon early peoples there was usually an attempt to conceal it under old forms, or to claim for it superhuman authority. It was unthinkable that individuals should create new social patterns or new laws.

Yet even in primitive societies the extent to which children are conditioned varies. In *Growing Up in New Guinea* and *Coming of Age in Samoa,* Margaret Mead has given us two vivid but contrasted pictures of present-day upbringing among relatively primitive peoples. Among the Manus people of New Guinea attention is concentrated on physical adaptation to life in the lagoons. From the first, when the baby learns to grasp his mother's throat as he rides on her back above the green waters, he is acquiring the physical techniques necessary for his life in that watery world. Very early in childhood his physical education is practically complete. For the rest, the Manus people inculcate a strong respect for property and a strict observance of taboos, but there is little moral discipline, nor do they introduce children into the adult social pattern or train them in specific jobs. In Samoa, on the other hand, the newest baby finds itself at the bottom of a large family hierarchy, in which everyone above has specific duties to perform, those immediately above being baby-tenders. Individually the child receives little attention or affection, but his place in the group is assured, and his tasks have a meaning in the life of the whole society.

> "The Samoan child measures her every act of work or play in terms of her whole community; each item of conduct is dignified in terms of its realised relationship to the only standard she knows, the life of a Samoan village." (Pelican ed., p. 135.)

Throughout their lives Samoan children move in groups —families, age-gangs, and finally the organisations for young men and women in which the community gives them recognition and definite obligations. Individuality is nowhere highly articulated except in the dance, which is a highly individual activity set in a social framework. Contrasting these two examples, the Manus child appears to show more individuality, but the Samoan child is more secure and socially adjusted.

If we turn to early Jewish education we see that the emphasis is still on given community purposes, but that increasingly it is less ritualistic and more directly moral, as the appeal to conscience begins to emerge.

> "And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. . . . And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates." (Deut. vi. 6–9.)

The heart of Jewish education lay in the duty of the father to hand on to his son the *Torah* or living tradition which he had received from his fathers. Later this responsibility passed to the synagogue school where the core of education was still the study of the Law and its observance. The Jewish community had a high moral purpose: it dedicated its men-children to the service of God, yet still the dedication was made by the parents, not by the individual for himself.

Greek education in the classical period still shows traces of primitive initiation ceremonies, as, for instance, in the annual flogging of Spartan boys entering manhood. These ancient ritual elements have now become part of an ethical and political education of individuals, but the avowed purpose is still a community one—to make good citizens, rather than good individuals. Even the Athenian system, though more liberal and many-sided than the Spartan, was clearly related to the need for bringing up children in the traditional habits and sentiments which made for the stability of the State.

For a period after his formal education was finished, the Athenian youth was taken to civic assemblies, the law-courts, the dramatic festivals. Here was direct recognition of the truth that the life of the city itself, in the deepest sense, is the real educator of its young. At eighteen came the solemn moment of initiation into adult life and responsibility, when all his education was summed up in the oath which the ephebos took to the State:

> "I will not disgrace my sacred weapons nor desert the comrade by my side. I will fight for the temples and public property, whether I am alone or with others. I will hand on my fatherland greater and better than I found it. I will hearken to the magistrates and obey the existing laws and those hereafter established by the people. I will not consent unto any that destroys or disobeys the constitution, but will prevent him, whether I am alone or with others. I will honour the temples and the religion which my forefathers established." (Freeman, *Schools of Hellas* (1912), p. 21.)

This oath sums up a type of community education in which the emphasis is still on the given pattern, but the moral responsibility of the individual and his distinctive contribution are beginning to emerge. The young man

promises loyalty to his inheritance in the community: certain fundamental principles, as embodied in the temples and the constitution, he will never alter or destroy. But his individual part is recognised: he may have to act alone; he is to hand on his fatherland greater than he found it; he will probably play his part in the formulation of new laws. In the life of the community there are fundamental, unchanging assumptions, but there is also a developing, changing pattern to be recreated by each generation.

The tension between community and individual is clearly illustrated in the clash between the 'old' Athenian education and the new philosophy of the Sophists, who set up the rights of the questing individual against the claims of law and custom. It was the urgent need to resolve this problem in some way which produced the educational theories of Socrates and Xenophon, and finally the synthesis of Plato. For Plato education is clearly related to the needs of the State: every person is to receive training for the part he is best fitted to play in the well-ordered community. But essentially education has a twofold aspect: a training from infancy in the habits and sentiments which make for goodness, and, on the other hand, for the ruling class at least, the intellectual apprehension of that all-comprehending truth which he calls the good. The importance of early moulding influences, and particularly of music, is emphasised constantly, yet Plato states emphatically the ultimate right of the individual to seek truth for himself:

> "It is currently said that it is wrong—indeed, positively blasphemous—to prosecute inquiry or busy ourselves with the quest for explanation where the supreme God and the universe as a whole are concerned . . . but the plain truth is that a man who knows of study which he believes sublime, true, beneficial to society, and per-

fectly acceptable to God, simply cannot refrain from calling attention to it." (*The Laws*, tr. Taylor (1934), p. 208.)

If we turn for our next illustration to early Christian education, we find that a new note is sounded in the challenging emphasis on an other-worldly allegiance to which the individual is called. In the first days of the Christian Church there was no question of fitting in to a given pattern. A small group of individuals was summoned to stand forth alone in separation from the world and create a new pattern of living. The writer to the Hebrews (speaking, it is true, of pre-Christians) expressed this other-worldly aspiration in memorable words:

"For they . . . declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." (Ch. xi. 14–16.)

In the first centuries of the Church this repudiation of earthly ties and loyalties took many forms, and it is not surprising to find that Christians in the Roman Empire were attacked chiefly for their antisocial and disloyal attitudes.

Yet the new emphasis on personal choice never leaves the individual standing *in vacuo*. His status is not absolute but relative, dependent upon his relationship with God. His true life, therefore, is still to be found in relationships, first with God, and then with his brethren in the family of God—the Church. The Christian doctrine of the sanctity of the individual does not mean that he stands in grand isolation, but that he finds his true status, as a child of

God, through membership in this new community, the Church.

In the history of the Christian Church we must look for a new type of community education in which the young are nurtured in the new faith and pattern of living. It is a pity that we know so little of this Christian education in home and church in the period before the recognition of Christianity by Constantine. For there must have been an absolute clash of loyalties between the community of the Church and the social and political order. In the midst of pagan Roman society, how did Christian leaders train the young in a quite other way of life, and build them up in an allegiance to this withdrawn, other-worldly community?

After the triumph of the Church over Roman and Barbarian, there came the magnificent, if imperfect, attempt of Western Christendom to build the City of God on earth. Law must embody divine principles, the ruler must exercise his authority under the law of God, and all social relations must be idealised in terms of duty to God. Society was seen as a divinely-ordained hierarchy which gave to each his proper place with its appropriate rights, duties and virtues. The tension between a this-worldly and other-worldly order remained, indeed, for in idea, if not always in practice, the monastic vocation expressed the aspiration to partake here and now in the celestial order, but essentially the individual found his true significance through fulfilling obligations in a community, which, whether within the world, or withdrawn from it, gave him his religious duty. John of Salisbury likened the body of society to the human body, comparing the soul to the religious, the head to the prince, the eyes, ears and tongue to the judges, the hands to knights, the feet to peasants and so forth.[1] This became a basic mediæval conception, in which the functions of Cleric, Knight and Peasant were

[1] *Policraticus*, V, cap. 2.

as clearly distinguished as the parts of the body, but equally bound together in one organism.

It followed naturally that mediæval education was vocational—a preparation for a definite part in the community life, and a preparation, moreover, that was religious as well as functional. The method was that of associating the pupil with a practising master in the craft—the method of apprenticeship, and it was of the essence of apprenticeship that the young craftsman should imbibe the standards and social traditions of his trade as well as its techniques. "To raise up honest and virtuous masters to succeed us in this fellowship for the maintenance of the feats of merchandise": [1] here in this guild regulation we have the aim of a community education very clearly expressed. The guild was a social community in itself, and within its stable, well-regulated pattern of life the apprentice learnt, not only his economic function, but the standards of morality and behaviour which regulated his dealings, and his religious duty in the fraternity. Academic education was also, in a sense, vocational, and the university was modelled on lines analogous to the guild. Theology was the queen of the sciences, and ultimately knowledge was pursued, not for its own sake, but for the glory and service of God. Again, the young gentleman was sent to serve his 'apprenticeship' as page and squire in a noble household, where he learnt, not only the techniques, but also the manners and moral code of chivalry appropriate to his station in society.

So far all our illustrations have shown the predominance of community requirements over individual needs in education. In the Renaissance period—using that term very loosely—there begins a swing-over which is perhaps the biggest in the history of educational ideas. The change is slow, and the old conceptions continually reappear, but gradually the emphasis shifts from training in vocation

[1] Lipson, *Economic History, The Middle Ages* (1923), p. 283.

to the making of a perfect individual. It is, of course, only in the upbringing of the ruling classes that this change is to be traced. Renaissance educators stress the harmonious all-round development of each person—physical, social and artistic, as well as intellectual and moral. This is expressed in the type of education designed by Vittorino da Feltre for the Gonzaga family and their contemporaries.[1] Certainly these fifteenth- and sixteenth-century educationalists still think in terms of rearing worthy citizens and rulers,[2] yet clearly the emphasis is shifting from technical preparation to the general development of the individual. The ideal type of the Italian Renaissance is the many-sided man, *l'uomo universale*. Thus, Castiglione's purpose in writing *The Book of the Courtier*[3] is, ostensibly, to provide the Prince with true councillors, but the portrait which stands out is that of the full, well-rounded individual. Less attention is paid to inculcating the faith, morals and traditions of the community and more to drawing out the powers of each person: "A Liberal Education is one which calls forth, trains and develops those highest gifts of body and mind which ennoble men."[4] At the same time the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and the absolute right of free inquiry are asserted. Thus the social aspect of education tends to fall away, and of the new product one might say 'Behold a Man, complete in himself, trained without reference to any specific social context or function, and therefore capable of dealing with any situation, developed in all his innate capacities and able to stand alone.'

Since the Renaissance, the individualist or 'liberal' theory of education has had full play in Western Europe. It underlies the whole idea of a gentleman's education as

[1] Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre, and other humanist educators* (1897).
[2] See Woodward, *Erasmus, concerning Education* (1904), and Ascham, *The Scholemaster*, ed. Mayor (1863).
[3] Trans. Hoby, 1561. See *The Book of the Courtyer*, Tudor Library (1900).
[4] Vergerio, quoted Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre*, p. 102.

a training of all the faculties through the medium of classical studies. Thus what was, *in fact*, the vocational education of the ruling class was formulated in strictly non-vocational terms. But theory and practice are often vastly different. There *must* be community education, for the group cannot avoid, in some degree, imparting its characteristics. Thus we can trace in England during the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries various types of social education which sought to implant a general character pattern through the daily experience of a group life. The success attained in this respect by the universities, Nonconformist academies and English public schools is seen in the extent to which they bred an attitude of 'spontaneous conformity'. Paradoxically, it was only on this ground-base of implicitly accepted attitudes that the doctrine of intellectual freedom could be built. But whatever the underlying common assumptions, conscious educational theory more and more glorified the independent status of the individual. Thus Herbert Spencer asserted the superiority of knowledge which an individual can verify for himself as compared with knowledge which rests on tradition.[1] Again, of the nineteenth-century German universities it has been written:

> "Never in history did an educational system formally rely to such a degree on intellectual liberty and personal responsibility as did the pre-Hitler university system in Germany. Its basic idea was the absolute freedom of self-education for every individual student. There were no fixed curricula nor any tutorial system. . . . Communal education and everything which resembles college life were practically unknown. . . . What should matter in education was nothing but the harmonious unfolding of the innate qualities of the individual. . . . Yet, in actual fact social conduct and the patterns of life

[1] *Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical* (1861).

of the students were entirely pre-formed by the feudal and military standards of Prussian tradition." (A. Löwe, *The Task of Democratic Education.*)

In the final phase of this theory, we find the educationalists of the early twentieth century growing more and more doubtful of the validity of *any* training in social habits and morality, or the inculcation of a traditional faith. They stress the importance of free inquiry and experiment, and the intellectual training which makes this possible. 'Influence' and 'bias' in education are taboo, and the education of the emotions is to be achieved solely through giving them free play. Thus Bertrand Russell defines the object of such education as "to provide opportunities of growth and to remove hampering influences".[1] The logical culmination is seen in the so-called 'free' schools which flourished chiefly between the two wars. Here—so far as possible—the rule of an external law or moral code was banished, influence was withdrawn, and the children left to interpret their own experience as best they could. Some theorists even maintained that the ideal school would eliminate the teacher, since children came to maturity best without the intervention of adults.

It is important to realise that the movement for mass-education in this country began at a time when the emphasis was thus shifting from upbringing in community to the intellectual development of the individual. It is, of course, absurd to say that *for the first time* the masses were given education, for, as we have seen, community education had always existed. But now industrial change had broken down the old community groupings and swept away many of the ancient techniques. It was precisely when apprenticeship systems were breaking down and unskilled jobs increasing that the aspiration for a general intellectual training of the

[1] *Education and Social Order* (1932), p. 29.

people began to be voiced, and the system of State schools took shape. What these schools were to give was a watered-down version of the general academic education which had first been designed for the gentleman. Some State schools have tried to imitate character-training features of the public schools, but on the whole State education has been mainly individualistic, with little attempt at a training in community life or a code of social behaviour. The size of classes probably made this inevitable, since mass intellectual training is, to some extent, possible, whereas mass social education is a contradiction in terms. Thus education in elementary and secondary schools has on the whole been general, not vocational, that is, an education *in vacuo,* well symbolised in the School Certificate examination. For some few only has this education been in any sense vocational—namely, for those who were proceeding to college and university and who intended, in one way or another, to make the craft of letters—and increasingly that of the laboratories too—their life's work. Of course, pieces of vocational training have crept into the curriculum, notably commercial subjects, but these are often regarded with disfavour, and, increasingly, vocational training of all kinds has become suspect—an attempt to palm off less than the best on the lower classes. Thus the Renaissance ideal of the gentleman, tied by no circumstances and master of all, applied on a large scale, divorces 'vocational' from 'general' education, and narrows education, in the main, to an intellectual drill.

In the first quarter of this century, State education evolved, on the whole, on these individualistic lines. At the same time, the Church was becoming less significant as an educating community, whilst the family was beginning to abdicate from its function as the supremely educative community. Thus, as regards his faith and morals, his relationships and his part in the community, the growing individual has been left increasingly to stand on his own

—possibly without prejudice, but also without guidance. The inner chamber of his loyalties has been swept, garnished, and left empty. It will not remain so, for in a world so vast and complex as ours today, individuals cannot stand alone in glorious isolation. The only question is—What new faith will take possession?

This question has already been answered on the Continent in the totalitarian régimes which, regarded educationally, represent a complete swing-back from the individualist or 'liberal' idea of education to an emphasis on the community and its requirements from its members. As against the liberal, the totalitarian asserts that mere intellectual education is unreal, since even words, consciously or unconsciously, embody and transmit emotional attitudes; that since influence is inevitable, it should be deliberately exercised by the conscious selection of certain experiences and aspects of knowledge; that this selection should be made by the leaders of the community in accordance with the underlying assumptions on which the community life is built, and the functions the individual is required to fulfil. The individual, he claims, needs this social upbringing within a given pattern of relationships and values. It is the function of the community to give this.

There is undeniably much that is true in this reaction. It is a mistake to attack the totalitarian systems of education without recognising the justice of the assertion that the 'liberal' theory of education was neither true nor adequate. Education *is* a social matter; each one of us needs a proper social context if he is to grow up truly himself, and the importance of emotional influences can hardly be over-estimated. Yet when we examine Nazi education —to take the most obvious example—we are at once conscious that it repudiated certain values which, having emerged in the long process of history, we cannot now deny. It appears, in fact, as a throw-back to a more primi-

tive stage of tribal education. In the first place, it denied an objective standard of Truth, and, therefore, one of our most precious gifts from the Renaissance—the autonomy of all the different sciences. The selection of information in Nazi education was made, not so much with the intent of bringing the young to a whole and a true view of the world, as to ensure that they accepted the particular Nazi *Weltanschauung*. In the second place, it completely subordinated intellectual to emotional training: the most important thing was so to condition the young emotionally that when the key words or symbols were used they would make the right response. And thirdly, following from this, it used every kind of emotional device to enhance the power of the appeal and enthral the individual. At the heart of Nazi education there was a denial of the integrity of the individual: he was permitted neither to seek truth by free inquiry for himself, nor to understand exactly and soberly the community in which he must play a part. The Nazis gave German youth once more an essential sense of 'belonging', but they demanded from the individual a blind participation at a sub-personal level. Their education was designed solely to perpetuate the community.

Now this doctrine obviously offends against both the humanist's belief in the value of the individual and the Christian's emphasis on an other-worldly allegiance transcending duty to a this-worldly group. But the important thing is, what kind of a reaction against totalitarian education shall we get? Much recent educational writing in this country seems to be still predominantly 'liberal' in its assumption that education must be 'free' (without inquiring into the nature of freedom); that it must prepare the individual for 'life' (without asking what kind of life); that we must 'educate for leisure' (without considering work, the essential obverse to leisure). But can we really go back to these superficial ideas? Are we not seeking a new synthesis at a deeper level between the life of the

community and that of the individual? The community must have a *Weltanschauung* and must be prepared to give its faith to its children; and yet, at the same time, at the heart of that faith there must be the conviction that individuals matter more than groups and must never be enslaved by them, since it is to the individual soul in its lonely citadel that the absolute challenge of God comes from beyond time and space. Once again, we see two opposite truths in education: that all education given by a group is necessarily and rightly religious, an upbringing in its own faith and pattern of life, and yet that at any moment the individual may be summoned forth—whether in the name of Truth or God—far beyond the faith or the claims of any earthly community.

CHAPTER III

THE MARKS OF TRUE COMMUNITY

THE most potent instruments of education, as we have seen, are groups of people. But people may be gathered in many different kinds of association. Some have as their specific object the welding of many human beings into one instrument of precision, whether it be for marching in step, or tending machines, or carrying out the commands of the Führer. This drilling of feet or hands or brains, we should easily agree, is a type of sub-personal education. The co-ordinated activity of an orchestra, on the other hand, obviously involves a true education of the members, although it may include a tremendous amount of precision drill. Of all types of association, fortuitous agglomerations of people, with no common purpose, or only a very superficially imposed one, are the least likely to give a true education, for they most easily kill personal significance. Yet within any of the mass groupings or chance associations that we may think of, there may, at any moment,

appear true social groups from which the individual members draw strength and nourishment. An obvious type of this is the comradeship of workmen at the factory bench.

We have, then, to distinguish, from all the chance collections of persons of which this age provides so many examples, those true communities which alone can give a fully personal education. What makes a social group really capable of nourishing the individuals within it? We shall consider five marks of the truly educative community. First, the life of the group must be subject to the rule of a law which is beneficent and consistent and—as far as possible—willingly accepted by each member. Secondly, all the members of the society must treat each other as persons. Thirdly, each member must find a significant part to play in the life of the whole, the purpose of which he understands as fully as possible. Fourthly, the group must contain an element of 'mixture', so that there are tensions and differences to be experienced. Fifthly, the group must serve some purpose bigger than the immediate self-interest of its members.

The child needs for his growth a given framework of law and order. This is a truth which the Christian should have understood from his theology, but alas, in the heyday of individualism he let it slip, and it has been left to the psychologist to rediscover the necessity of a 'given' order to enfold the growing person in security. If we start from the conception of God the Creator who sets Man His Creature within the framework of the universe, then it is clear that man's true life can only be lived in so far as he endeavours to obey the laws of God's order and to express these in his societies. If we start, with the psychologist, at the other end, it is equally clear that the child needs for right growth the security of belonging to a reliable and ordered community. The educative society, therefore, must order its life according to a consistent law, and teach its members to accept this law with understanding. Com-

mon to all societies is the obligation to keep and to teach the given laws of the natural world which govern the way we use the resources of the earth, and our own and other people's bodies. In other respects the character of law depends on the nature of the group: discipline in home, school and club must differ, although each must be based on the recognition that 'ye are members one of another'.

In the early stages of growth law is experienced chiefly as the fixing of a boundary between one's own and somebody else's 'space'. To draw this line is a delicate matter. Within his framework each child needs a satisfying 'space' in which to express himself, that is, he needs room to develop his body, materials with which to play creatively, opportunity to make himself heard and to claim attention. But he also needs to discover that his 'space' is bounded by other people's, and that if he encroaches on their freedom he pays the penalty. Thus he must be taught that there is a time and a place to run and shout and kick, to mess with water, or hammer in nails, or claim the undivided attention of grown-ups, but also times and places which belong to other people, and in which, therefore, he cannot do these things. He needs an adequate space, but with boundaries. Discipline must allow scope: self-expression must have limits. Later, he must discover the positive aspect of law—that it makes possible far more fruitful co-operative efforts than could have been achieved in a state of anarchy. At every stage it is of vital importance that the regulations to which he submits should be accepted by him as fundamentally reasonable, and intelligible at least in part, if not wholly. In details he can sometimes obey without question, if he believes the adult authority to be inherently trustworthy. What matters most is the fundamental attitude of those in power. Are they anxious, above all, to make the law as intelligible, and to administer it as consistently, as possible? Or do they merely regulate for the sake of regulation, indulging a lust for

power which is the perversion of law; do they punish arbitrarily, according to the bad temper of the moment, or the amount of personal damage sustained?

The importance of writing the community's law on the hearts of its members arises from our second condition: that all the members of the group must seek to treat all the others as persons. This means, as we have seen, that each must be aware of the others as those whom he may not exploit or enslave to his own purpose, but whom he can *meet*, enjoying co-operative activities, or at a higher level, communion of spirit. The root of this matter lies in Buber's distinction between the I–Thou and the I–It relation. The danger in all human societies lies in the temptation of some members to *use* the others, and so reduce them to the category of It.[1] Now Buber insists that the true I-Thou relation can only be momentarily maintained in the flash and counter-flash of meeting and that all 'Thous' at times must become 'Its.' True personal meeting cannot be manufactured to order, and in many types of group, for instance the large school, the neighbourhood, or the trade union, the meeting of persons on Buber's mystical level may be non-existent or confined to very few. The home obviously offers more scope for personal relations than the workshop, and educating societies inevitably differ in this respect according to their several purposes. Yet there is a vast difference between relegating persons permanently to the category of It, as resources to be used for one's own end, and treating them as *potential Thous*, as those with whom communion is possible and infinitely valuable. It is of crucial importance that in *every* group the young should be treated primarily as potential Thous, not as Its, as persons and not as 'hands'. For a sustained attempt to reduce a person to an instrument weakens the

[1] "The primary relation of man to the world of It is comprised in . . . using, which leads the world to its manifold aim, the sustaining, relieving and equipping of human life." (Buber, *op. cit.*, p. 38.)

capacity for personal living not only of the exploited but of the exploiter. This does not in the least mean that one person must never be manipulated or controlled by another. In many group-activities precise, co-ordinated action and instant obedience are essential. For a moment the village tug-of-war team becomes a complete It heaving at the word of command, but celebrating victory in the pub it has become again a jolly social group enjoying its own company immensely. A class of children can drill with absolute precision, and yet in the general life of the classroom they may be learning to respect each other and to join freely in varied activities. What matters most is the fundamental attitude of the members one to another, and, in particular, that of those in authority to those they control.

Some people confuse this business of treating one's fellows as persons with an attitude of sentimental softness, but in reality it has nothing necessarily to do with a display of affectionate emotion. The root lies in our third point—that each member must have a significant part to play in the whole. Within his given framework the child needs to find a worthy part to play which is all his own, for essential to his growth as a person is the experience of finding himself to be of value to other people. Even the youngest member in the group should have his own jobs, yet adults so often forget this when they say: "I can do it much more quickly myself". No service can be on a really personal level unless its purpose is at least partially understood as a part which fits in to a whole. Thus the truly educative community (whether home, school, workshop, or what) takes pains to see that group activities are understood and accepted by members as good and necessary, not only with the mind but with the will. The test lies in the degree of genuine responsibility which the individual will accept—responsibility not so much in the commonly used sense of directing others as in the sense of

directing oneself, that is, of doing one's own job because it matters.

The fourth mark of a true community is that it should contain a real element of mixture. It is, of course, impossible to collect any group of absolutely similar persons, but people are often sorted into categories of comparative uniformity. This is sometimes very necessary for specific purposes, as in a common level of attainment in an arithmetic division, a single age-group for national service, a collection of six-footers for a guard of honour. But these are limited purposes, concerned with the training of one capacity, or with the use of the individual in one context only. Unfortunately we are apt to apply the same principle to the meeting of persons in community. We assume that the fullest kind of community is that in which the members are most like-minded. In fact, the contrary is true. If the essence of community lies in the true meeting of person with person, the essence of meeting lies in the recognition of the other, not as an echo or replica or extension of the self, but as someone *different*, with whom one can yet hold communion. It is a strange truth that the deepest community is founded not upon an easy toleration or agreement-to-differ, but upon clashing views, passionately held in tension, yet always with recognition of the other's right to independence. This real grappling of spirit with spirit can only be achieved occasionally, but any social group which contains elements of variety or difference, recognised and accepted as such by the members, forms a richer community than the flat, uniform group of 'likes'. This principle of mixture can, of course, be applied in many different ways, for there can be mixture of age, ability, class, conviction and so forth.

A corollary to this principle of difference is the recognition by the group of the rights of the 'solitary', whether child or adult. Children need to belong to, but they also need to be able to withdraw from, the group, whether

escape is into some chosen tree-top of retreat, or simply one of imagination. If we are sensitive to this need, we shall not rudely invade a child's own special 'tree-top' or break in upon his aloofness, for every child has the right to be aloof—just as every child has the right to be bored. The best kind of community life represents the swing of a pendulum between active occupation in the concerns of the group and withdrawal into aloneness. Thus the true community must recognise the right to be aloof or solitary, and the right to be peculiar in taste or outlook.

But difference by itself would only make for a warring confusion. True community consists in difference or mixture brought together on the basis of one common purpose or fundamental unity. Groups can unite to serve either their own self-interest or a purpose in some sense 'bigger' than this. A group whose activity is entirely inward-looking, towards its own interests, as, for instance, a self-absorbed family or a school focused on exam. results, can never be a true community, for the ultimate crown of all community is the exhilarating experience of joining hand to hand in the service of a cause which catches each member clean out of himself. As members of churches and philanthropic bodies know, and as so many in A.R.P. or fire-fighting services, or the Forces, discovered during the war, the comradeship that is a by-product of great work carried through together passes description. There are, of course, degrees of 'bigness' in the purpose. The narrowest and most sterile of purposes is the immediate self-interest of the members. A purpose can be 'bigger' than oneself if it brings pleasure or advantage to more than oneself (e.g. in the running of a tennis club), or if one is fighting to gain or to retain rights which will benefit future generations (e.g. in the trade union or women's suffrage movement). The biggest purposes, and therefore the deepest communities, are those which most transcend private self-interest, but groups of all kinds and on

all planes—whether social clubs, Women's Institutes, humanitarian or religious bodies, or what you will—have a very great part to play in developing this capacity to serve purposes bigger than oneself by progressive stages. For the Christian, all lesser purposes are gathered up in the all-embracing purpose which he shares with the whole Church—to do the will of God, 'Whose service is perfect freedom'. This is the crown and summit of community education. Here the individual finds his completest fulfilment.

One or two of the points already discussed call for further comment. First, this question of whether we aim chiefly at sorting people into groups of 'likes' or at constructing mixed communities. The idea of uniform categories has much attraction in this age. This arises probably from methods of mass-production, based on the principle that the more exact the uniformity, the more speedy are the processes of manufacture. Thus to get the greatest possible return for expenditure in labour and capital we assemble the largest possible number of exactly uniform objects. From manufacturing processes the principle has been extended to the grading of apples, eggs and other natural produce. There is a real danger that we shall apply these methods of large-scale production to education. The argument runs thus: employ every method of scientific classification to get as uniform a group as possible, and then apply a uniform method of 'production', reducing to a minimum the wastage of effort caused by dealing with individual differences. Determine the size of classes by the maximum number of finished products which can be efficiently turned out with the given equipment and teacher-labour. This is, of course, an exaggeration of the argument, but something of the kind is implicit in many of our schemes of educational reorganisation and in other social spheres.

We fail to distinguish a partial from a total objective.

To produce a good arithmetician or a fluent speaker of French, we must certainly grade as exactly as possible according to mathematical or linguistic ability, and then ensure that the processes are applied in the right order. To make a person is a vastly different process, demanding, in particular, two conditions which set it quite apart from mass processes—groups small enough for the genuine interaction of person with person, groups mixed enough to give the real flash of difference and adjustment between individuals. The basic natural group in which all human beings are set, that is, the family, especially the large one, usually fulfils these conditions, and this is a fact worth pondering on. But we have been so keen to departmentalise —to classify into age-groups, into A, B, C and D streams, into social classes! The great housing estate, arranged by income levels, and the large school, graded to the *n*th degree, are more efficient and economical, but they stand less chance as communities than the old mixed neighbourhood and the small mixed school. Economy and efficiency in the attainment of lesser objectives must, however, have their place in education. Probably the true policy is to recognise the value of grading *for certain limited purposes,* but to seek, both in more strictly educational matters, and in society generally, *for cross-groupings of all kinds* in which different mixtures are shaken up together.

We are especially prone to departmentalise into age-groups. We like to speak of the 'under-fives', of the 'Primary School child', of the problem of the 'fourteen-to-eighteen-year-olds'. Behind these categories lies the hope that if we can only isolate a particular age-group and state its problem correctly, we can set about saving it by itself. This is especially true at the moment of the 'Youth problem', where we speak of the 'claims of Youth' and the 'needs of Youth' as if they stood in complete isolation from the rest of the community. There are three fundamental types of human relation—with those older, with

those younger, and with contemporaries. *All three are necessary to the individual,* and to cut him off in any way from those above or below is to impoverish his life. Of course there are gang stages, when relations with contemporaries assume a special importance, and the urge for contemporary society must always be properly satisfied, but to encourage the notion that 'Youth has no use for kids or old folk' is a bad mistake. It has never been so in the large family, and Margaret Mead has given us an interesting example from the primitive society of Samoa of how important to each person is his place in the hierarchy of age, attributing to this factor the comparative absence of emotional difficulties in adolescence:

> "The newest baby born into such a household is subject to every individual in it. . . . But in most households the position of youngest is a highly temporary one. Nieces and nephews or destitute young cousins come to swell the ranks of the household and at adolescence a girl stands virtually in the middle with as many persons who must obey her as there are individuals to whom she owes obedience. Where increased self-consciousness would probably make her obstreperous and restless in a differently organised family, here she had ample outlet for a growing sense of authority. . . ." (*Coming of Age in Samoa,* ch. iv.)

The growing person must continually be adjusting himself in these three relations—with those who are 'above' him, to whom he owes a proper respect, with those who are on the level with him, whom he meets in the give-and-take of equality, and with those who are 'below' him, whom he must lead and protect. Without these three relations he cannot learn the fundamental attitudes of humility, equality and responsibility, or, in other words, know when to obey, when to co-operate, and when to lead.

There are many different kinds of hierarchy. The simplest—that of age—is most important in the education of children, but as we grow we discover various forms of social hierarchy which may or may not be acceptable to us. In the general revulsion of feeling against inequalities of class, wealth and privilege, it has become popular to deny the validity of any hierarchy. The cry is 'all men are equal', and from this follows the educational slogan 'equal opportunity for all'. This at once commands sympathy: a false hierarchy of privilege which gives one child a better chance than another is manifestly unfair, and equal opportunity seems to follow directly from belief in the infinite value of the individual. But in fact such talk about equality is extremely confused. There is a sense in which all men are equal, but there is also a sense in which they are very much unequal. This is most clearly expressed in the Christian view of man: all men are of infinite value in the eyes of God, since Christ died for all; but each is called to occupy his own particular place in God's scheme, to serve Him in a peculiar capacity. There is equality of *worth,* but difference in *function.* If we try to iron out differences, we lose the richness of a community life in which each plays his own special part, and impoverish personal living, since, as we have already seen, the full life is contained in *three* relations.

The mediæval Church enunciated the hierarchical principle very clearly, not only in its own structure, but also in its doctrine of secular society. God has assigned to each man his proper place, with its appropriate rights and duties, with its proper obedience matched by its proper authority. 'To each his own' sums up the mediæval claim for everyman.[1] In the course of time the hierarchy grew so complicated and top-heavy that the Protestant swing-

[1] Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society* (tr. Bennett), 1940, chs. 1 and 2. The idea of the hierarchy extended throughout the universe: "Men should rule the beasts, angels men, and archangels angels" (Gregory I).

back to the basic equality of all believers was inevitable. This is the ultimate foundation of modern democracy, with its emphasis on the general rights of man (as contrasted with the mediæval conception of the particular liberties of each), and its claim that each individual should be free to seek the position he desires. As so often, truth seems to lie in holding together two opposites. Taking our stand on the fundamental worth of every human being, we have to recover the conception of society as an organic body, in which each person finds his true life in fulfilling his own peculiar function.

The crux of the matter lies in the question: How does the individual find his true place? We cannot subscribe to a hierarchy founded on birth, wealth or any other extraneous factor. What we desire is that each growing person should be enabled to find the place appropriate to his temperament, capacities and sense of vocation. Position should be founded on personal qualities alone. This can never be wholly achieved. Factors of environment will inevitably enter in, for some children will always get a good start and some a bad. But, granted the limitations, we have to construct our educational system, not so much on the principle 'to each the *same* type of opportunity', as 'to each the *appropriate* opportunity'. We do no service to the boy who 'finds himself' through tinkering with motor-cars, or constructing in wood, if we push him through a grammar-school education into a black-coated job because 'he must have the same chance as the other'. There are two big problems here. One is that of framing the type of record or test, and devising the system of transfers, which will ensure that children really get the education appropriate to themselves. This is receiving much attention today. The second is the problem of destroying the social snobbery which regards one type of education as more privileged and therefore 'better' than another. This will not be met until, on the one hand, every type of

school has equal status and adequate provision in buildings, staffing, etc., and, on the other hand, conditions of work in different types of job and their social evaluation have been levelled up.

Granted an approximately correct assessment of the child's capabilities, there remains the question: How are we to train him for his appropriate place in the community? This is where the argument so often goes wrong, for, once the principle of a hierarchy is allowed, we so quickly jump to the conclusion that this means training people *either* as leaders *or* followers, thus selecting a permanent aristocracy of intelligence. The phrase 'education for leadership' usually implies the special training given to an élite who, once trained as leaders, will always lead in any situation. The point we must grasp is that in a true community *the order of persons should not always be the same;* it should, in fact, vary from situation to situation. Thus the intellectual leader in club discussions gives way to the born organiser of whist-drives and socials; the Egyptologist consults the plain countryman about his pigs; the brilliant young technician must defer to the aged in judgment of people. The true community is one in which there is no fixed or rigid hierarchy, with a permanent leading caste, but rather a *real interplay of persons* who have learnt when to speak with authority, and when to keep silence. Education for community means, therefore, experience of living social situations through which each can come to know himself justly in relation to others. An education which over-develops one attitude by producing either the permanently superior attitude of the leader or the permanently submissive attitude of the follower can only be called sub-personal. Equally so is the education which produces the permanently aggressive attitude of 'I'm as good as you'.

To talk of finding one's appropriate place in the community pattern sounds dangerously like an enslavement

of the individual to a grand community scheme, unless we make the necessary corrective in balance. At the heart of community education we must preserve the integrity of the individual and our belief that the community exists for his fullness of life and not he for it. To safeguard this we must continually apply the test of *understanding*. The child needs to have his roots in a society which existed before him and which nurtures him in tradition and purposes. He needs a proper pride in group achievements (whether of family, school, town or nation), and the upstandishness born of a sense that he belongs to a worthy society. But, to retain his freedom, he must understand fully that to which he belongs. He must be taught how the pattern grew and how men changed it in the past; he must face the black spots of failure as well as the highlights of achievement; he must learn to examine its life critically and to assess its values soberly. Finally, as he becomes a responsible member he must be free either to repudiate his allegiance altogether, or to play a full part within, in correcting failure and re-shaping the pattern. For, above all, the community must be dynamic and not static. This end is extremely difficult to achieve. It is comparatively easy to breed critics who stand outside, or loyal conformists who remain inside, but to bring up sons within the group who will be both critical and loyal involves a fine discipline, not only of the young, but of the adults in the group. For the quality of critical loyalty belongs to one whose affections are deeply engaged, but not so entangled that he cannot suffer change or development in the institutions he knows; whose love is based upon an exact and sober knowledge, so that he can appraise without illusion that to which he belongs. Every group or community has to combat within itself some form of vested interest in its present form (ranging from vested emotion in the family to vested property in the State), and the test of its educational uprightness lies in the degree to which its

adult members are prepared to see the order of things re-created by a new generation of loyal but clear-sighted members.

CHAPTER IV

THE PATTERN OF SOCIETIES—I

One of the characteristics of a totalitarian régime is that it seeks to gather up the loyalties of all other groups into one overriding allegiance to a single organism. Its education of the young, therefore, approximates as closely as possible to an upbringing in a single group. One of the essentials of democracy lies in its belief in many groupings and free association. Thus the pattern of its education should be an ever-widening experience through the life of different groups, each with its distinctive characteristics and purposes. It is essential that we should recognise and safeguard this variety, and not seek to make all education approximate to a single type. In this chapter and the next we shall trace out the pattern of educating societies, not as it is but as it ought to be in education today.

The fundamental—to the Christian, God-given—society is the family. There is little need here to set forth the tantamount importance of a true home as a basis for living, for the evidence of child-guidance clinics, evacuation surveys, and so forth, is well known. To quote only one example, Anna Freud's studies in a residential war-nursery show the difficulties of providing a substitute for home-life in early years. The institutional child "is at a disadvantage wherever the emotional tie to the mother or family is the mainspring of development".[1] The characteristic features of the home as a society are that it is

[1] *New Era*, July-August 1943. Also Burlingham and Freud, *Young Children in War-time*.

small and intimate, yet mixed in age-range, and often varied in temperament. For the children the family is not a self-chosen society but 'given'. They have, in the first place, to learn how to live in a group which is not a 'congeniality group'. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that its life is regulated, not by the rules of an institution, but by the delicate operations of personal relations. The significance of the mixed family group can be learnt from the contrasted experience of institutions:

> "These institutional children do not start out to meet a world of contemporaries, secure in the feeling that they are firmly attached to one 'mother person' to whom they can revert. They live in an 'age-group', that is, in a dangerous world, peopled by individuals who are as unsocial and as unrestrained as they are themselves. In a family they would, at the age of eighteen months, be the 'little ones' whom the elder brothers and sisters are ready to protect and consider. In a crowd of other toddlers they have to learn unduly early to defend themselves and their property. . . ." (A. Freud, *New Era*, July-August 1943.)

A child's education in the home consists, primarily, not in what is said to him, but in certain fundamental experiences. First, it is essentially here that the experience of law and order must begin. From the outset, the child needs to be over-arched, as it were, by the settled law of his world, and contained within an order which is older than he and which lies round about his childhood. This is expressed primarily in the everyday arrangements of the home, in the settled order of the day, in the rule that there is a right use for things and a right place for them. It is in the home that the clamorous claims of small individualists must first be brought into proper adjustment to the needs of other members. So often we fail to strike

a right balance between scope for self-expression and necessary limits to freedom, either allowing the child to be a nuisance to everyone, or repressing him so completely that he is forced to burst out in naughtiness. Ideally, children need a room (albeit the box-room), a corner, or at least a cupboard of their very own, where they can be about their own ploys, use messy materials like clay, and leave half-finished constructions. This makes possible the rule that all possessions must be tidied back into this 'den', and that the treasures of others (e.g. mother's best carpet) must not be destroyed by improper usage. Some people argue that adults should not have both treasured possessions and children, that if they choose the latter, the house must be denuded of breakables and spoilables, but to eliminate everyone else's rights and leave children free to use or misuse everything they find is no true upbringing in community. The true principle is, surely: their *own* possessions and their *own* place, together with a clear understanding that they must not invade other people's rights. The trouble is that so seldom does our houseroom allow adequate space for children. A shed in the garden or backyard can solve the problem, but flats and neat little boxes of houses in dormitory suburbs can cage the young terribly. We are so busy providing labour-saving gadgets that the claims of growing persons are seldom considered in house-planning.

Children like law and order. Of course if we let them rip and then try to reduce the unruly, they do not take kindly to it, but essentially they are ritualists, and, just as the much-loved story must be repeated in remembered phrases, so, when it is assumed from the start, the settled order of the day, with mealtime and bathtime in their due season, becomes the very basis of their security. They need a rhythm in harmony with the natural order which decrees a proper alternation between passivity and activity, sleeping and waking, seedtime and harvest. The very

roots of spiritual education lie deep down in this principle of alternation. A whole family tradition and ritual of the seasons needs to be built up. It is easy to see from many varied reminiscences of childhood [1] how in later life we hug to ourselves the thought of this family ritual: 'Just now we looked for fairy cups. Now we went to see the first lambs. This was bee-orchis time. This was mushroom weather.' In this respect, country childhoods, with their wealth of activities succeeding each other in due order, score a great deal, though there is no real reason why a true town life should not have its proper ritual.

The great obstacle to this settled order lies in the clash between adult and child interests. If parents go to the pictures or visit friends late, the child's order is disturbed, for his bedtime goes by the board and he is dragged home cross and tired at the adults' pleasure. A life ruled by the whims of grown-ups is a most damaging experience, for, above all, the child needs reliability in his adult world, since the knowledge that he can count on his parents to behave in certain consistent ways is the very basis of his security. Moreover, to the Christian, it is the human experience which must mirror forth, however faintly, the utter consistency of God, the Father of all men. But the adults must have their own life, and a compromise has to be worked out between the child's order and the adults'. It is of infinite importance that this, his first experience of law, should be trustworthy, yet so often punishment depends on whether we happen to be tired, irritated or pleased, how much our self-interest has been hurt, or whether we like the exercise of power. We let personal feelings get in the way: Mother reproaches Jane because she has broken her *best* vase, or because 'she doesn't love her'; she appeals to her 'to please Mother', or not to 'let her down in front of visitors', and so into a plain matter

[1] See, for example, A. Uttley, *The Country Child*; E. Lewis, *Dew on the Grass*; V. Hughes, *A London Child in the 'Seventies*.

of family discipline an intolerable pressure of personal obligation is introduced. The administration of family law needs to be a straightforward matter-of-fact affair, with as little emotion and emphasis on moral guilt as possible: the one thing necessary is that children should know exactly what treatment they will get if they do such-and-such.

The second essential experience in the home is that of being loved and of learning to love others. The child discovers that he is of unique value to other people, not for any extraneous reason, but simply for himself. Hence he learns to be most truly himself in unselfconscious freedom. And love received soon flowers in love given. He begins to look for ways to help and to give. Here it is very important that he should have a chance to play a distinctive part, undertaking his own special jobs within the family life. He begins to see other members not as rivals to be fairly treated but as those whom he loves. For these he learns to do things gladly, and to accept self-limitation cheerfully. Thus discipline develops from the external rule of a just parent into the willing attempt to curb self-interest in the service of those one loves. This inner law of love cannot be forced; that is why an appeal to ties of affection can only be very judiciously made. Love is necessary food for the young: one has only to watch the efforts of children who are starved of love to gain attention somehow by *any* method, to realise how desperate is their need, for starved affections are as much a tragedy as starved bodies. The simple truth is that no one can grow fully as a person without this basic nourishment.

The third experience which the family must give is that of encouragement to venture forth. Growth consists in free and eager response to that which lies beyond oneself, but freedom grows out of security; when the child has his feet firmly planted within the society to which he belongs, he is ready to seek fresh experience and from his

home-base he must be gently but firmly pushed forth. Only the outward-looking family can do this properly. The inward-looking family, in a tight little circle of self-interest, offers no natural chances to the young to establish outside contacts and meet new experiences, but the family with varied interests provides many in its comings and goings. Gradually the young establish their own circle of friends and activities. Nearly always these are happiest and most successful when there is no violent breach between home and outside contacts, but natural links between the two. The young need to learn from their families the arts of entertaining, and then establish their right to entertain their own friends in their own way at home. Once again we touch the housing problem, for we need homes into which young folk can introduce company without becoming a nuisance to the rest. The swarms of smallish boys one meets youth-hostelling suggest one very healthy way in which the young can be encouraged to go off in pursuit of their own enthusiasms and adventures, and there are many other ways of 'exploring'.

The right of the young to adventure and experiment freely demands much wisdom in the adults of the family. It is disastrously easy to encourage them to evade the challenge of new opportunity or experience. Just because we have given them our care and love, inevitably we want to keep them safe, to save them from mistakes, to bring them up faithful to family traditions. So the temptation to possessiveness creeps in, and in manifold ways we are prone to mould our children into replicas of ourselves. The hard thing is that the more we have given them our deepest ideals (and so our real selves), the more we want to make sure that they cherish these. Yet if we really believe in the 'otherness' of persons we must be ready for all kinds of experimenting and questioning, for searching criticism of our own way of life, even for the repudiation of the family faith and the painful experience of having

thrown back into our teeth all we most care for. At this point some adults are prone to say, 'Very well, let him go his own way. I wash my hands of him.' This is precisely what a good family cannot do. In adolescence development has the rhythm of a swing between the two extremes of independence and dependence. At one moment the boy is kicking over the traces, chafing at restraints and demanding to go his own way; at the next he is swinging back in desperate need of comfort, guidance and security. The true home, therefore, needs the quality of 'always being there', ready to receive, to bind up the wounds, and to advise when asked, *but never to hold.* The model for this kind of attitude is given to us in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

In the great quest after a faith for living what ultimately matters most is not what is *said* in the family about beliefs, but the real purposes for which it lives. Its faith is implicit in its everyday living, especially in the choices it makes between this and that 'good' (e.g. in a family discussion on careers where a choice is made between the 'goods' of money, power, or security). The only true basis of family life is devotion to a cause beyond itself; the crucial thing, therefore, is that the adults should have committed themselves to the service of a 'good' which is bigger than self-interest. If there is a definite foundation of conviction and purpose in family life, its imprint upon the child is already strong by adolescence. Then is the time to withdraw that influence to a little distance, lest a too-painful tension arise between personal conviction and family ideals. The adolescent needs to feel that his parents are prepared to give him, sincerely and carefully, a reason for the faith that is in them, but that in his own life the choice is his alone, an issue finally to be fought out in solitude. The most disastrous experience is that of a negative family life, in which the adults are not committed to any great belief or purpose, for then the family fails in its final

duty of challenging the young to enter the service of a worthy faith.

All these experiences—of law, of love, of freedom in adventure, of challenge to commitment—become, in the Christian family, phases in religious education. It cannot be too often emphasised that 'religion in the home' is not confined to specifically religious exercises but involves *the values underlying the whole of family life and all its everyday arrangements,* which in the Christian family must be related to a fundamental theology. The orderliness and discipline of the home, the love and care of parents, the give-and-take between brothers and sisters show forth, albeit imperfectly, the order of God's universe, the nature of His Fatherhood, the brotherly love of His children. Direct religious teaching becomes the explanation of values implicit in the home, and its highest activities—family worship and family church-going—become a summing-up of all its manifold life.

To examine the child's entry into societies outside the family we must go back to his earlier years. Very soon he becomes aware of a wider world which lies round his home. This is the street or immediate group of houses. People come to the door, neighbours appear, shops are visited. He begins to discover an order in this activity: certain people, like the postman and the baker, come regularly to his home; at certain times of the day people come and go in the street; particular shops play an important part in his mother's schemes. All this is intensely interesting and his mouth is filled with questions: Where does this road go? What is that man doing? Where do all the things in the shops come from? He begins to play at being postman or milkman; he is, in fact, discovering his neighbourhood. The important thing is that he should discover in all this activity an ordered community life into which his family fits. These folk who visit regularly —'butcher and baker and candlestickmaker'—all serve

his needs; the shops do likewise, and grown-up members of his family go out to serve the community in their turn. He needs patient, careful answers to his questions, so that bit by bit he can piece together the pattern of ordered activity—the plan of streets, the scheme of shops, the interlocking work of different people, and so on. In these ways he must assimilate and make sense of his immediate neighbourhood under the key ideas of order and mutual service.

This is easier for the country than for the town child. Village geography is simpler, its economics less complicated, its connections with basic human needs more direct. The child soon knows just what business everyone is about and the whole idea of the village community lies easily within his grasp. For one child in a village under the downs a definite stage in education was achieved when, climbing to the top of the hill, for the first time she said to herself: 'Now I can see the whole village. The pattern of the roads goes like this. There is the church, the school, the shop and everything laid out before me.' A new sense of power and confidence was born when she saw that to which she belonged. This process of growth is much more difficult for the city child, since the vastness and complexity of the group swallows him up. But in reality his basic neighbourhood is the small area served by one small shopping centre, or a little group of streets. Even the confusion of the city really falls into a pattern of small social neighbourhoods, but it is more difficult to disentangle, and the whole question needs to be investigated from the angle of explaining his environment to the city child. The basic group of shops supplying immediate needs, some representative light industries and workshops, the community buildings of school, church and entertainment—these, with homes, should make up the ideal pattern of the domestic neighbourhood.

"A neighbourhood should be an area within the scope

and interest of a pre-adolescent child: such that daily life can have unity and significance for him, as a representation of the larger social whole: and accordingly a special effort should be made in the design of neighbourhoods to incorporate in them those light industries which directly subserve neighbourhood life. . . . The direct observance of all kinds of industrial processes in the open workshops of Athens no doubt gave to Plato and his fellow citizens that visual acuteness and that intelligent grasp of the processes of existence which accounts for the extraordinary production of able minds in a town that certainly never harboured more than three hundred thousand people." (Mumford, *Culture of Cities* (1940), p. 473.)

It is easy to slip into a false antithesis between town and country life, especially in arguing their relative values in education. But the basis of human life is the same in both town and country: all human activity depends on 'given' materials; seedtime and harvest are equally important to town and village, so are machines and the products of men. Most landscapes in this country express an intermingling of the work of God and man, and the basic truth thus embodied in the scene around them must be brought home to *all* children. For town children the imagination must be kindled to realise the earth beneath their pavements and the processes of nature upon which all their active town life is built. They need rural experience, therefore, not so much to counteract the evil effects of industrialism, but to explain the bases of their own town life. In the town itself they need a chance to play with elemental things like earth and water, to scramble in wooded and jungly places, to grow plants and keep pets. Country children need to be confirmed in their own way of life, but also to understand industry and machinery in relation to it, and so be up-to-date in their attitude to science. Two

false attitudes must be eradicated: the townsman's romantic view of the countryside as existing solely for his playground, and the countryman's idea of the glamorous town which leaves him far behind the times. Both town and country must represent worthy ways of living, closely integrated, conscious of their common basis, and exchanging educational experiences for their children.

Luckily, the child's entry into a wider world is no longer left to the doubtful chances of family education and street play. He is sent to school. The school has a double significance—as a society in itself, and as the interpreter of the pattern of communities. As a society it stands in contrast to the family and forms the child's first entry into the general, mixed world of men. It is of great importance that this is a guided entry and not a haphazard plunge. At school the child for the first time meets a large crowd of his contemporaries, and begins to learn the give-and-take of equality. He finds himself controlled by adults who are bound to him by no special ties, and whose attention he must share with a number of others. He is called to learn from the necessary but not very palatable experience of being just one among all the rest, making his own way on his own merits. This does not mean that teachers should not give individual care and help, but essentially the teacher is not the parent, nor the school the home, though this is sometimes forgotten both by over-anxious parents, and by over-interfering teachers. The teacher's attitude needs to be positive—outgoing in warmth and wise in guidance—but also objective—viewing each child justly in relation to the rest. Often the very fact that he is not so emotionally entangled as the parents makes him able to handle the child in a way which they cannot. There need be no question of rivalry between the two, but a recognised difference of relation. The teacher is there mainly to help the child stand on his feet in the world of men. This education can begin in the nursery school.

The age at which individual children are ready to make this entry will always vary, and therefore it is essential to keep this first period of schooling voluntary. In these days of small families, however, the value of the nursery school for most children is very great, not only for its physical care and training in hygiene (vital though these are), but still more for its social education within a free yet ordered community. In its scope for full self-expression set within the framework of its carefully adapted order, the nursery school gives an experience which is the basis of true communal living. This is no substitute for home education, and must not be allowed to become so; it is the child's first venture into independence, and happy is the child who makes this step into the security of a good nursery school.

The school is essentially heterogeneous in character. Except in the few cases where it serves a special group or an unusually homogeneous district, children will come to it from every kind of home, with every kind of basic assumption of faith and values. Out of these differing elements the school must seek to build up a true pattern for its community life, but it will only achieve this soundly if it recognises this fact of heterogeneity. The real task of the school is to create community out of accepted differences, an experience which is a preparation for life in the wider world of men. It must see itself, in fact, as the world in microcosm, a society where every kind of attitude, pagan and Christian, will meet, but which, because it is made up of persons, will always transmit values, and therefore give religious education.

The nature of its law, its common purposes, and its personal relations matters, therefore, profoundly. If law is merely an affair of external rules, and the aim offered no more than a competitive scramble for athletic and academic successes, there will be little of the true community in this fortuitously assembled group. But if school life is

full of purposeful and co-operative activities, if laws are made to increase the possibilities of activity and accepted as useful by the majority, if movement is free and spontaneous, yet ordered—then the elements of a true society are present. The test of this lies far more in the 'feel' of the community than in any formal marks: an altogether admirable scheme of self-government on paper may not achieve that which in another school seems to grow spontaneously—the sense that everyone is working eagerly for real ends and that the law of the community is written on the hearts of its members. Work has to be both co-operative—a pooling of forces to carry out big activities—and individual—placing on each the responsibility for carrying through his own jobs. Thus the test of a true classroom community lies not in a mechanical precision, but in the *busyness* of everyone, working singly or in groups, and intent on the purposes before them. For this free interaction of persons (and let us remember that the relation of child with child is as important as that of child with teacher) small enough units are essential, with possibilities of cross-groupings and larger combinations. Probably the ideal pattern is that of a class of 15 to 25, mixed in ability, but more or less of an age, which can be split into groups of three or four, and at the same time combined with other classes in a good age-mixture for big enterprises, such as the management of the school farm, the production of a play or a puppet show, or the building of a model. Of course, for precise drilling in the 'tool' subjects, like arithmetic and languages, grades can be designed to cut across classes.

The school can thus form a genuine community, and yet it is unrealistic not to take full account of its partial character and of its heterogeneity. It cannot impose a complete faith or way of life because it represents only a fragment in the life of its members, for whom more fundamental experiences lie elsewhere. Its education is 'religious' in

so far as it inculcates values and inspires with great purposes, and, indeed, the education of any group of persons is bound in its underlying assumptions to be in a certain sense 'religious'. But it cannot, of itself, implant a certain creed, churchmanship or denominational pattern (except when it represents a selected religious group), because it contains such a variety of home experience. To plaster one denominational pattern over the top of this heterogeneity is a travesty of religious education; if it is done perfunctorily, the child usually dismisses it as quite unreal, and may thus be effectively inoculated against all religion; if it has driving force behind it, a bewildering conflict may be set up between the values of home and school. The school has to face frankly the fact of difference, and help children to stand in a world of conflicting creeds and values.

This brings us to the second aspect of school life—the school as the interpreter of patterns. There is urgent need for the consideration of just why we teach this and that, and what the purposes of the curriculum really are. Clearly, one objective is to teach the skills which will enable the young to cope sensibly with life in this modern age. To play a useful part they need, not only the recognised 'tool' subjects, but also an elementary knowledge of electricity and wireless, ability to read maps and railway timetables, some domestic training (for both boys and girls), and so forth. In a world of growing complexity, it is essential that people should be able to cope, and it is the school, mainly, that must see to this. But a far deeper purpose of the curriculum is that it should *explain* the child's world for him, help him to make sense of things. If each child is to understand that to which he belongs, the school's rôle as *the interpreter of experience* is vital at an age when new impressions are hurtling in on him from all sides. To do this realistically we need to forget the orthodox curriculum and, starting with the children

themselves, ask ourselves: what do they really need to know in order to understand the pattern? We shall soon find ourselves teaching material which could easily be labelled history, geography, science and so forth, but from a new angle, and without rigid 'subject' divisions. The child needs to understand himself and the workings of his own body, the natural world around him, the way men have discovered and used its resources, why his town or village came to be established just here, its life and workings today, and its place in the national and international scheme of relations. So the understanding of the pattern goes outward in widening circles. This work may be done on different levels at various stages: it may begin with 'centres of interest' on the dairy or the local works, on the job of policeman and postman, on methods of local transport, on local geology, or on more general aspects of a child's environment, such as printing and books, homes and furniture, clothes, hygiene or hospitals. But later in the school course there is much to be said for a sustained and comprehensive local study or regional survey. This should seek to put all the data of community life together: its geography and relation to natural resources, its evolution, its economics and amusements, its government and social services, its past achievements and present problems. Most educationalists recognise now that the school must not be a withdrawn community, but an outgoing one, a centre from which to conduct "visual and tactile explorations of the environment", a society "taking stock of and taking part in the life of the neighbourhood, the city, the region".[1] There should be a constant going-out and coming-in—the school going out to explore or to serve the neighbourhood, the adults of the community coming in to give their expert help and to explain their special jobs. This study of the living community is the beginning of citizenship and the basis for a study of

[1] Mumford, *op. cit.*, pp. 473 and 477.

national and international affairs. Problems of society and government are most intelligible when tackled first in simple and concrete local forms, and we make a great mistake in plunging children directly into general history and national politics without a training first in local history and affairs.

If common remarks about school subjects mean anything, history for many was the deadliest part of their education. It should be one of the most illuminating. The proper study of history in the academic sense is an adult subject, and much of our failure in schools is due to the painful attempt to teach a parody of real history to those who cannot yet even understand its terms. But it is quite false to argue from this that the young have or need no sense of history: all children should be given what we may call an experience of history, because this relates to two great and contrasted needs of human beings. On the one hand, as we have already seen, they need to feel that they belong to a society which existed before them. *Every* social pattern contains the dimension not only of space but of time; it is a mistake to say 'We have no castle or ruins and our church is a nineteenth-century monstrosity, therefore we have no history', for no community is too new to have a history of some sort, though it may be disturbingly meagre in the new mushrooms towns. Intertwined in the lives of all children there are inescapable elements from the past, and they need to fit in the historic bits of their pattern, both the domestic history of their families and houses, and the public history of their towns. From the simple, personal question, who lived in our house before we did? to the much more intricate, why did our town grow just here? there is a whole range of historical questions to which children need answers. But, on the other hand, they also need at times to be transported clean out of their confined, immediate circumstances into a wider and richer world, such as that of a completely

different period in history, with its exciting variety, colour and strangeness. Such 'escape' is essential to all; the only question is whether people escape into a spurious world which unfits them for real life or into one which is, in the deepest sense, 'real' and therefore sends them back into their own lives enriched and reinvigorated. History can be 'real' escape in this sense: a child who has been seeing the Parthenon against blue skies in fifth-century Athens, or visiting the Kublai Khan with Marco Polo, or viewing the Pacific with stout Cortes—or maybe has watched Cavaliers and Roundheads clattering down his own street—comes back to that street again stimulated and enlarged in vision; he may perhaps *see* his world quite freshly through eyes opened by the experience of difference. Furthermore he has been learning to stand in other people's shoes, and this training of the imagination is surely the beginning of international understanding.

It is not possible to elaborate a history scheme based on these principles here. All children up to about fourteen should enjoy some historical experience of both types just outlined, that is, they should trace the evolution of things in their own background and be transported in imagination into rich and satisfying 'patches' of history. Choice of material will be openly determined on subjective grounds, according to the aspects or 'patches' of history which are *really appropriate to the children's experience or which give answers to their real questions.* It is time we stopped being afraid of this word 'subjective'. A recent writer defines history as "the intellectual form in which a civilisation renders account to itself of its past".[1] We can no longer pretend that history is the study of *everything* in the past, but must frankly acknowledge it to be the study of those elements in its own past which any community feels to be significant to it. The activity of historical study consists in fact in asking and seeking

[1] J. Huizinga, in *Philosophy and History*, ed. Klibansky and Paton (1936), p. 9.

answers to those questions about the past that one feels to be the right ones—always remembering that the desire for truthfulness is the basis of all study. Applied to children, this means that we ought no longer to think of history as a complete set of facts they 'ought to know', but as the discovery of answers to the questions about the past *which they feel to be real ones.* Thus they may establish an intimate feeling of connection with the past, gathering for themselves on their chosen patches that detailed knowledge which is beloved of children. After fourteen, more systematic work should begin, but still that of carefully selected themes rather than the study of general periods. Two important themes to be worked out are the evolution of methods of government and the history of 'getting things done'. From small beginnings, for instance in manorial courts and local government, to the evolution of Parliament, the theme of how men have learnt to co-operate in government must be traced out, and, on the other hand, the techniques of reform, the methods by which men have sought to influence public opinion, to change the law and re-create the social pattern. There is splendid food for the future citizen in the lives of Wilberforce and Francis Place, in the campaigns for factory legislation and the struggles of early trade unionism. Thus the quality of critical loyalty can be fostered. Whilst only some will reach the systematic adult study of history, all will gain a sense of their own past and an imaginative sympathy for other ages and other peoples. This historical experience is a vital element in true community education.

The study of community life cannot, and should not, be divorced from the examination of its meanings and values. It is impossible to teach facts without implying value-judgments, for even a negative attitude (as in the case of the bored teacher who taught Clive in India and hardly bothered to mention the Indians) carries these implications. The school's job is to grapple with controversial

matters, not to avoid them, for to make sense of the world you must ask: What is all this for? Are these doings good or bad? So, throughout the school course, there must be opportunity to discuss the meaning of things, to criticise and assess achievements, to examine community values. The plea of getting through the syllabus is no excuse for avoiding discussion which contributes to the most important part of education—the building up of one's own philosophy. If every part of the curriculum carries implications of values, every subject teacher in handling these must shoulder responsibility for 'religious education'. That is, whilst expounding his facts faithfully, he must be alive to the implied view of the meaning of life which underlies his attitude to those facts in, say, the sciences, English literature, or history.[1] It is part of his job to uncover these implications for examination, but his purpose must not be to lay down an authoritarian creed; rather it must be to help the young examine the implications of their own lives for themselves.

This involves the frank recognition of clashing values and differing creeds of which we have spoken. Especially in later school years discussions on the meaning of life and the purposes of community will often lead to fierce clashes on the thorny issues of religion and politics. These must be tackled firmly just because they are the most absorbing topics to growing boys and girls. A period on the timetable is needed for discussion which ranges over the whole field of life, which draws on all the differing experiences and viewpoints in the class, and which requires only honest opinion and a desire to think things through. The teacher's rôle is not to make the final pronouncement which puts all differences out of court, but to help the young face the implications of their own arguments, to see that differing viewpoints are fairly put, and finally to give,

[1] See, for example, C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (1943), on the philosophy underlying much current English teaching.

when appealed to, a sober and reasoned account of his own position. Teachers of clearly thought-out convictions who are not afraid to give an honest answer on deep issues are the only ones who really cut any ice.

The study of the Christian faith is a logical part of this interpretation of the pattern. Christianity belongs to our general inheritance, and, whether his family be agnostic or Christian in outlook, the child needs to understand something of this religious element which has played so great a part in building up his community. Churches and chapels are scattered about his town, and, if only to understand his environment, he must know why they are there. The Bible, too, in its English version is a great heritage to which he must be introduced. There is, in fact, ample justification for systematic, intelligent courses on the Bible, on the central doctrines of the Christian faith and on Church history for all children except those whose parents specifically object. There is no need to 'water this down' to an undenominational compromise: just as in teaching history differing viewpoints can be stated forcefully and completely, so in later school years denominational views of Christian doctrine and churchmanship can be fully examined and discussed, especially in the light of the differing experiences of church-going within the class. The key-note must be intellectual understanding, with a clear recognition that the school's function is not to inculcate a special brand of churchmanship, but to give a balanced presentation of the Christian Church as it in fact exists in the world today. Churchmanship can only be learnt within the practising group: the school is not the Church. Nonetheless, the school Scripture course has an important part to play. It can give systematic, scholarly instruction of a standard beyond the resources of many churches, and by frank recognition of clashing viewpoints, both as between denominations and as between Christian and non-Christian, can help the adolescent to face confusing dif-

ferences, and meet his desire to discuss these things outside his family.

In short, having regard to the limitations imposed by the heterogeneous character of the school, the essentials of its religious education can be stated thus: first, a religious approach to *all* knowledge, that is, an attitude of sincerity and humility before the facts and a determination to draw forth their deeper implications for the meaning of life; secondly, discussion of the kind already outlined, which faces conflicts of values and seeks to interpret experience; thirdly, an integrating Scripture course which sets forth the Christian faith coherently in relation to the world the young are just discovering. A faith can only be properly expounded by one who is 'inside' it; therefore Scripture needs to be taught by Christians of deep conviction, and yet these must be prepared to take up their stand 'outside' the faith in order to meet many of their pupils. "They protest too much," said a VIth Form boy, of earnest Christian teachers. Far more effective, in this context, than over-anxious purveyors of the faith, is the Christian who accepts realistically all the limitations on his work in school and, witnessing to his Christian faith *as a working hypothesis,* is prepared to sow his seeds and wait for them to mature in due season. The young will respect and trust him as one who has thought things through to the stage of conviction and is ready to help them carry on this process for themselves.

But can an objectively-taught course on Christianity be an integrating force in a school which reflects all the clashes of value in the community? The school can give certain common experience, but can it attempt *any* deep integration of meanings? The issue shows itself most clearly when the clash of philosophies appears, as so often, on the staff. When the Christian, the scientific materialist, the humanist may each, through his own subject, be showing forth sincerely a different philosophy, can the

school do anything more than 'hold the ring'? The logical answer seems to be No. Yet one's instinctive judgment denies this. We *must* seek to lessen conflict and give positive guidance because the young need this protection in the earlier stages of education. (The time for 'holding the ring' is really in the later stages of university and adult education, and this presupposes the security born of earlier guidance.) It is not easy to see the way out of this dilemma. It would seem, however, that more parents desire to have their children taught the Christian faith than any other, even if for the vaguest reasons. If on this ground we may call England a half-Christian country, may we not say that the school is justified in putting the Christian view of the world in a central place, with the best possible teachers to make it an integrating principle? This does not mean that we can eliminate conflicts. Clashes of philosophy in teaching cannot be ignored nor lightly resolved, but at least they can be brought into the open in staff discussions which seek to get down to rock-bottom issues, instead of playing with surface questions. Often more of a common mind on values can be reached by frank discussion than appeared possible, and at least everyone should be made aware of tensions, and forced to face properly their responsibility as guides of the young.

The same question arises in a different form over school worship. True worship must be the highest activity of a society, growing right out of its life and summing up its experience. 'Morning exercises' in school may be of as little real significance as a top-dressing of prayer in a secular youth club. The question is not what ideally a school society ought to do, but what in fact it can do with its given materials. What is the real spiritual atmosphere of our average schools? Are we so far gone in paganism on the one hand, and so set in denominational compartments on the other, that the common worship of this heterogeneous school society can have no live significance? This

question must be faced by sensitive teachers in many different schools, and they will give different answers. Hazarding a judgment, may it not be that many children are only a generation or two removed from some kind of Christian practice, and that, therefore, the idea of Christian worship still lingers sufficiently in the family memory to form some sort of basis for school worship? Many families still have a dim instinct for worship in special crises or on special occasions, and we may, perhaps, start in school from the assumption that most children are not brought up to regular worship, but that worship is not entirely foreign to their experience, and that, if properly approached, they take to it gladly and naturally. The wrong approach is to assume that prayers are the 'done thing' and impose a set form from above. The right approach is to try to make worship a genuine activity in which all take part. This means that the young must discuss its meaning fully, help to plan forms of service, and participate in their conduct. To achieve this we should, perhaps, think less of daily prayers and concentrate more on particular services planned for high-lights of school life and great Christian festivals. Worship must be a real and intelligible experience that crowns everyday life: the crucial thing, therefore, is to be sensitive to the everyday experience of the children.

CHAPTER V

THE PATTERN OF SOCIETIES—II

EDUCATION does not cease with whole-time schooling. Boys or girls pass out into other societies and continue to learn from the groups in which they find themselves. What they need, above all, is continued guidance, so that their entry

into the adult world is not confused and violent, but orderly and gradual—a planned transition. The significance of the new part-time education lies in its power to make this transition by equipping and guiding all young people who are beginning to make contact with the world of work. Its unique chance will lie precisely in its *part-time-ness*. We may very well feel that the upper limit of whole-time schooling needs to go still higher, and that part-time schooling should at least be half-time schooling, but these points do not alter the fact that there is a special need for educational guidance *side by side with entry into real work*. This experience of work is of immense educative importance. There comes a point in the development of many adolescents when the withdrawn and, in a sense, artificial activities of the school world cannot carry them any further. For the next stage in education they need to be confronted by real tasks which are of importance to the community, and by the discipline of work which must be done if they are to live. With the first pay-packet should come a new sense of personal status. This is a vital stage in growing up, for it should foster self-confidence, sustained effort and responsibility. But this educational importance of the job has been obscured, on the one hand, by the pressure of economic forces exploiting the young as cheap labour, and, on the other, by the devices of the privileged who prolong whole-time schooling and thus put off for their children the entry into work. In fact the whole meaning of work is at present confused by economic and social conditions. Two points must be made clear here: first, that in so far as secondary schools, colleges and universities train for work needing academic equipment, they can *in theory* form a parallel to an industrial apprenticeship, and the obligation to sustained and real work can be as real in the one as in the other; the second point is that in putting off until past 21 all thought of real work the privileged tend to lose in personal development more than

they gain in prolonged play. When we can clear away the confusion of thought created by bitter class distinctions in the past, the issue must be looked at *educationally*: What is the best age for the young to begin considering and training for their service to the community? Should this training take place under master workmen in the factory, together with part-time work at school, or wholly under the masters of academic crafts in school and college? This latter point must be decided *on educational grounds* alone, and for all a generous provision of further general education must be sought. Clearly we cannot achieve these ends without great changes in social and economic structure.

As boys and girls embark on this new phase of life what they most need is proper educational oversight: first, thorough-going advice on choice of work; secondly, a proper training in techniques, including as wide a knowledge of allied processes as possible; thirdly, a proper introduction to the general pattern of the industry or trade, so that they can understand thoroughly the purpose of their work, the way their part fits into the whole, and its service to the community; fourthly, a chance to appreciate what may be called the 'culture of the job'. All this involves many different agencies: school authorities and juvenile advisory committees; good master-craftsmen chosen specifically to teach techniques; labour or personnel managers to give an understanding of 'the works' as a whole; county colleges to complete the integration of culture and vocation, so that without inner conflict the young workers may " both perform their technical jobs and live richly as human beings".[1] There is no great industry, trade, or community service that does not possess a rich and fascinating background of knowledge [2]—the history of its human endeavour, the evolution of its machinery, the

[1] Clarke, *New Era*, December 1942.

[2] Agriculture, of course, is a major industry with, perhaps, the richest background of any; in these paragraphs such words as 'industry' must always be taken to include rural occupations.

growth of scientific invention, the geography of raw materials and markets for finished products, the economics of its organisation. This background, excitingly presented with good films, pictures, and so forth, can light up the job with a new understanding and significance, as in the case of some shipyard apprentices who saw their plate-riveting in a new light when they had had some talks on the evolution of ships. Professor Whitehead has written:

> "The habit of art is the habit of enjoying vivid values. But in this sense art concerns more than sunsets. A factory with its machinery, its community of operatives, its social service to the general population, its dependence upon organising and designing genius, its potentialities as a source of wealth to the holders of its stock is an organism exhibiting a variety of vivid values. What we want to train is *the apprehending of such an organism in its completeness.*"

An important aspect of this training is the study of labour movements and of trade unionism. The young worker needs to understand thoroughly the purpose and working of his union, and to be initiated into active membership by responsible leaders. In all this the quality of the workmen with whom the young are placed is of vital importance, and one cannot avoid the conclusion that they need to be taught by men specially selected for this responsible work and specially paid for it. It will be clear that all this training is designed not so much to make a good 'hand' (though this incidentally) as to train a growing person in the understanding and acceptance of his job. To the community the making of persons must always be more important than the making of 'hands'. Up to the age of eighteen at least the education of the young through their work should take precedence over their immediate usefulness in the economic sense.

> "The active routine and the orderly duties of workshop, factory, farm and office are likewise essential contributions to this education: but so far from education being ordered merely to prepare the pupil for assuming the economic responsibilities of maturity, it is no less important to order industry so that it will contribute to the maturing educational needs of its members." (Mumford, *op. cit.*, p. 473.)

The question whether there are jobs that adolescents ought not to do arises here. Clearly dead-end jobs and morally bad ones ought to be barred. The problem of extreme routine jobs is more complicated, for differences of temperament and intelligence affect the issue. In some cases we waste our pity on individuals who are happiest at routine work, as for example, in the case of the mentally retarded, but what we need to assert vigorously is the principle that *no boy or girl ought to have his or her spirit warped or killed by excessive routine.* There is a further point to be remembered: a mechanical job need not be insignificant. It is meaninglessness far more than monotony that kills the spirit. What makes routine work bearable is an understanding of the purpose behind it and its value to the community. It is most important, therefore, to kindle in the imagination of the young a sense of the *people* for whom they are making things, but this is a mockery if the only picture they can conjure up is of fat shareholders in nice arm-chairs. Thus there are two parallel lines of attack on this problem: first, to set up safeguards against cases in which routine work is positively harmful to body or spirit, and, secondly, to see that necessary drudgery—and all jobs include some—is meaningful.

In this same period the young are busy widening their social boundaries. They pass through the gang phase to a stage when they need to build up their own social circle and within it find their special friends. But they are often

very uncertain of themselves, trying desperately to be grown-up but failing, and needing especially to establish self-confidence by cutting a good figure in the eyes of others. The good family, as we have said, provides many links with a wider society, but for others this is the point at which the various youth movements and clubs become important. Organisations vary widely in pattern and avowed objects, but at bottom they all have one meaning for the young: the chance to 'find oneself' in a society of contemporaries. There is, therefore, much to be said for the not-too-large and not-too-organised club, where there are times to dally in conversation or to 'potter about', and where members can get to know each other at a truly personal level. One very significant demand of young people today is for a 'place of their own', that is, a canteen-club open to all, but without organised activities. They need opportunity to form friendships with their own and the opposite sex, they need a chance to learn social behaviour —for example, how to entertain guests, how to dance properly and how to run good dances—they need the experience of managing their own affairs and developing their own leadership. Thus, quite apart from what the club does in its programme, its *raison d'être* lies in the experience it gives of personal and social relations. The more spontaneous and natural its organisation, the more real this is. It is difficult to over-estimate the educational value of training in managing club affairs, in committee procedure and responsibility, in handling money, in planning and carrying through club efforts. All this demands of the club-leader a full and mature social life of his (or her) own, wisdom to guide in personal problems, and willingness to draw upon personal experience to help the young. They are wanting, above all else, to know what it feels like to be grown-up, and they need the leadership of one not-too-far-removed in age to remember his own personal tangles.

The second point of importance about youth organisations is the chance they give for discussing more deeply the implications of life and its meaning. This, as we have seen, can begin in school, but the plunge into a wider world of work raises new problems, and the youth club is an obvious place for frank discussion. When the club really gets on its feet and comes alive, this discussion will go on in countless ways—big groups and little, arranged debates or casual arguments, and when it waxes most furious it will almost always come back to those two questions, religion and politics. The leader's job is to make the issues clear, laying bare for the young the implications of their own lives. Above all, he has to summon them out of the state of drift, to show them that they inevitably live by *some* faith or other, and that to live properly they must make a conscious choice of this faith. These discussions must start just where they are—from jobs, films, make-up, and so forth—and in divers ways the leader must be saying to them: 'Do you know what your real gods are? Look at them. Are they good enough?' Discussion may reach the point where a Christian leader must say: 'The alternative to acting as if money (or some other god) is the chief end in life, is to act as if God is, and as if this is His world. This means it will only work His way, and we have to make our everyday choices in that faith.' In any discussion the leader must be prepared to give an account of the faith that is in him. Club members will not be preached at, but they do want to know in plain language where their leader stands. They will respect him for his convictions.

Youth organisations should lead onwards into a full adult social life. For the process of education through community is never at an end since adults, too, need varied social circles and worthy spheres of activity. There are two main types of adult association: the involuntary community of citizenship and the voluntary grouping in socie-

ties of all types. In England these interact in all kinds of ways, thus giving to our society one of its most valuable and characteristic features. It is important that Youth organisations should not be inward-looking and self-contained but continually introducing the young to the proper contexts of adult life. The first obvious one is the parish, town or other unit of local government. This is easiest where the unit is a natural community, and most difficult where it is artificial, as in rural areas, where the parish council is too small, and the district council too remote, to interest the young much. But the attempt must be made to give the fact of their citizenship significance. This education, begun in school, continues in the youth organisation, where every kind of local and social problem is discussed, and the present condition of the local community probably torn to bits by criticism. This is inevitable and right, for if the young are to enter creatively into their community life they must examine it frankly and critically. The difficult thing is to pass from wild, destructive criticism to responsible planning for the future. For this the proper techniques of reform have to be acquired: the critics must learn the necessity of collecting adequate data and of framing their schemes with an eye to all interests and contingencies; they must consider the ways in which the ordinary public can influence civic affairs through letters in the press, petitions, deputations and so forth; they must study the actual procedure of town council and committees, the process by which leaders in public affairs attain to their position and the price they pay for it. There is plenty of material in local newspapers and in agenda and reports of council meetings, but it must be presented in a stimulating form, otherwise the young will never get 'inside' local affairs. Nothing can quite take the place of this sense of belonging to and working with your neighbours in public affairs. One of the difficulties about this growth into citizenship is that there is so little scope for

active training. Few public leaders want to know the opinions of the young, there is no ceremonial initiation into citizenship, and no real recognition of their public existence until they suddenly find themselves saddled with the great responsibility of a vote. What we need is a gradual entry into citizenship: the young, through their youth organisations, should be asked to undertake services for the community, to study certain questions and to report representative opinions on these to the adult authorities. Service may well take a constructional form—laying out gardens, building sports requirements, constructing apparatus for children's playgrounds. Some may be encouraged to do neglected jobs (as one country group who cleared out rubbish tips and ponds), or to undertake services for the elderly and disabled, but whatever practical work is undertaken, it is important that training should be not only through useful jobs, but also through the exercise of mind and judgment in giving opinions. More especially they should be consulted, through representative bodies (e.g. a Council of Youth), on matters of policy affecting them closely, such as provision of sports grounds, youth centres, etc. They should be made to look closely at financial aspects, trained in the difficult art of budgeting, and summoned to report their views to local governing committees. It is easy to toy with the idea of a civic 'coming of age ceremony', but difficult to see this becoming a natural and proper thing unless it arises spontaneously out of some civic scheme of youth training.

Training in national obligations is intertwined with that in local. The sense of belongingness must arise through clear understanding and active participation. The process of understanding goes on throughout school and club discussions on history and current affairs, but active participation has little reality except through the action of political parties. This raises many difficulties, but there seems a clear case for instructing the young properly

in the function and working of political parties, for giving reasoned statements of different party programmes, and, at not-too-young-an-age, for putting to them the possibility of joining a political party, not as the sort of thing a few fanatics do, but as the proper action of responsible citizens. Social obligations can only be hammered out within a group of committed folk, and it is within the local political party that the young citizen ought best to learn how to scrutinise programmes shrewdly, to understand political procedure and to assess political leadership. This, of course, assumes that politics is not a dirty game, that the local party is genuinely democratic in organisation and that it is really educational in its treatment of young members. There has been recently much talk about methods of inoculating the young against the evils of propaganda, but this assumes that one stands outside all conviction, picking holes in every statement; it does not touch the problem of creating clear-sighted political *responsibility*. There are obvious risks in leaving this educational task, even partially, to political parties, but there is a definite type of political training which logically belongs to them alone.

Much is talked of education in international understanding, but this cannot take place in the void. It can only grow as international societies of persons work together, hammering out their differences and getting understanding through fellowship. This suggests that real international education lies at present in *voluntary societies of many kinds*. There are significant Christian developments here, of which the Youth Department of the World Council of Churches, with the great international conferences at Amsterdam in 1939 and Oslo in 1947 preceding it, is perhaps the most important. In this way groups of individuals must go ahead of nations.

Voluntary bodies are a vital part of our social inheritance. It is in the manifold activities of all kinds of societies, local and central, that the fullest scope for social living

must be sought. Here are many chances for leadership, for organising ability and varying talents. Here is found that characteristic technique of forming a voluntary body to pursue some worthy object which may ultimately result in official action. In this way some people's citizenship is best expressed through their championship of some one cause they take specially to heart (be it the welfare of babies or criminals or animals). This is a rich field for the young to enter. Locally, connections can easily be established between youth and adult groups, often through community centres where joint youth and adult activities take place. As for national associations of various kinds—humanitarian, cultural and so forth—it is worth while for youth leaders to introduce club-members to appropriate ones, as for instance, by means of informal discussions on a variety of organisations. (One such, called 'Let Your Bees Buzz', in which different members spoke about their own especial enthusiasms, was highly successful.) The Co-op is in some ways a unique society and in regions where this flourishes the history and purpose of the Co-operative Movement should be discussed. Many of the young, of course, enter adult societies with their families, but for others Youth Clubs have the duty of creating a bridge over into adult groups. The crucial point is the liveness of voluntary bodies: sturdy societies cannot be manufactured to order, but they have a special part to play in the upbringing of the young and a form of education to give which is unique.

From the society of the family, then, the young go out into the mixed communities of school and neighbourhood, of work, of citizenship and of voluntary societies. The characteristic of all these is their heterogeneity. One unites to work for specific ends with people who may base their lives on quite different creeds. But from the Christian family there is another outward-going avenue—into the Church. This is a community quite different from the rest. It is not a society to which one belongs automatic-

ally, like neighbourhood, nor yet a self-chosen congeniality group, like the club. It is mixed in age, sex, class, political viewpoint, and yet, underlying the tensions, there is a deep unity of common purpose. One is called to this society by a compulsion which is not of this world, and yet membership within it must be accepted fully by each person for himself. It cuts across every other community and overrides all earthly loyalties, yet it brings its members to grips with their specific responsibility in every social situation. It calls for a world-wide vision, and, at the same time, loyal service to its local manifestation.

The proper entry of the young into the life of the Church is through the family, for one of the characteristic activities of the Christian family is to take part unitedly in the work and worship of the Church. Thus the young, from the outset, worship as members of a group. Linked up with folk of all ages they join in activities which they do not yet understand with the mind, but the truth and beauty of which they feel. The Church should appear to the child first as the great society to which his family belongs, the family of families, as, looking around him, he sees the different families of the neighbourhood gathered together. From this he should grow gradually into the realisation that this family is only part of God's great society, the Church Universal. Thus the church is understood not as a place to go to, but as a *body of people* who do a variety of things together, but whose highest and most characteristic activity is the worship of God. The more many-sided church life is, the more deep and real is its common worship. Into this living fellowship of people who offer a rich variety of activities to the service and praise of God the young need to enter, belonging before they understand, and growing in knowledge by taking part.

The special needs of different age-groups have created Sunday Schools, Junior Churches, Youth organisations and so on, but let us think primarily, not of departments, but of

the young growing up within the whole life of the Church. The purpose of grading is to instruct the mind at differing stages, but worship is a much more complete activity, and the worshipping community is not a graded one but a fellowship in which old and young together unite to give glory to God. From this viewpoint the family pew, worship with the adult church through at least part of the service, and activities in which old and young join, are of real significance. However elaborate the church's youth-work may be, the general body of church members must never be allowed to lose sight of the fact that it is they who are ultimately responsible for the education of the young in their midst. They must continually ask themselves: 'Are we the kind of church that shows forth in its life the truth of God?'

Within this framework the special work of training the young goes on. There are a number of different patterns for this now, all with their special merits. Many hold that the Sunday School is outmoded, at least in name, or that the extension of secular education has altered its function completely. Whatever one's view on this may be, the vital educational experience is that of *doing things together in groups,* and therefore the youth work of the Church should be conceived in terms, not of children's meetings or passive Sunday Schools to be taught, but of *active societies,* in which children learn to play, to act and to sing, to make things and to serve others, to study and to worship all together. Donning chefs' caps the study circle may quickly turn into a busy group of cooks making Christmas puddings for the less fortunate. Thus intellectual instruction in the faith may be wedded to living social experience. Sunday Schools can be developed into true services of worship, planned and led by the young, in which the lesson (taken by adults) is only one, though an integral, part. In worship children need many varied symbols and forms of ritual, for it is natural to them to express the

truths they are learning through concrete forms and bodily activities. Thus processions, dramatic forms of worship, decorations expressing joy in the cycle of the year, and festivals of many kinds all find their place.

In this community, above all others, the young must learn to understand that to which they belong, for no one can be fully a member of the Church until he comes to know it, not as 'something our family belongs to', but as the body of those whom the inexorable call of God summons forth, if need be from home and kindred, to stand within this other-worldly society. The decision to 'join the Church' in this sense must be taken in the aloneness in which the individual faces God. The Church must, however, train for decision. It must ensure that a proper understanding of the Bible and of Christian doctrine is being built up. Increasingly general foundations are being laid in good day schools, and where this is so the Church's job is not to go wearisomely over the same ground but to concentrate on its specific and unique educational task—the explanation of its own churchmanship. This can only be taught within the practising body. Whatever the denomination, the young need instruction in its characteristic theology, in its doctrine of the sacraments and in the symbolism of its forms of worship. To enter properly into their traditional inheritance they need Church history—general, denominational, local. It may seem retrogressive to emphasise denominational heritages just when the œcumenical movement is getting under way, but, paradoxically, the individual member must be grounded in the traditions of his own group before he can really grasp the whole of which it is a part. It is true that denominational differences mean little to the young today, whilst the vision of the Church Universal really catches and holds them, but church membership must be worked out within the local manifestation of the Church Universal, and it is out of a fully conscious group tradition that

the young will make their best contribution to the œcumenical life of the Church.

Throughout, the education of the Church works towards one end—to bring home to the young the challenge to commit themselves to the service of the highest purpose. Committed people are those who have embraced a long-term purpose or faith, and whose lives, therefore, though they may deviate from time to time, press on steadily in one direction. They alone can be called free, for they alone are not driven from side to side by every passing whim of pleasure or self-interest. The higher the purpose, the greater the freedom, and the Church believes that in the service of God alone is perfect freedom. The problem is to translate this into terms of everyday living. It is fatally easy to expound theology in abstract, general terms, but in reality life consists of a series of living situations in which concrete choices must be made. The Church has to show that such choices spring from a faith, from a belief in some 'good' which determines action. To serve God means, therefore, not to apply a dead code of conduct, but to seek in each living situation to know His will and to act in the faith that He is the Lord of all life. Thus theology becomes a burning reality—a basis for creative choice. 'You must choose God or Mammon: if you try to drift, you will in fact become a slave to the gods of those around you; if you make a conscious choice and commit yourself with open eyes to the Christian faith you embark on the highest kind of adventure.' If the Church's initial challenge takes this line, two more difficult truths have later to be learnt: first, that "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you"; second, that, with Paul, "the good I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do". A sense of sin—which is quite different from admitting your breach of adult rules—does not seem to be an initial experience for many young people; rather it follows on the attempt to commit oneself to the service

of God, for it is only when one has tried and failed to serve properly the purpose one has embraced, that the deep sense of impotence which is the beginning of salvation can be born.

The trouble is that the Church fails at present to get across a theology for living because so often Christians are not sufficiently inside the lives of young people to know the real living choices which confront them, and to translate into their language the Word which God is speaking to their condition. We need hard work on this, in terms of escaping from generalities—on Christian conduct, Christian social justice, Christianity and the world of nations—and getting down to particulars: how does God speak to me in my home, factory, town, trade union and so on, and how can I learn what He is saying? Instead of supplying them with blue-prints of an ideal Christian social order, we need to train the young to make for themselves specifically Christian moral judgments and decisions in actual social situations. There is no slick and easy way of doing this, no hunting up texts for ready-made application. The only way is to soak oneself, on the one hand, in the local situation, and, on the other, in the mind of Christ, and then act and take the risks. Much of this training must be done through discussions rather than sermons, by examining the issues and values of contemporary society and setting them over against the values of God.

The Church has also to give what we may call training in commitment, through carefully graded service and responsibility, both within and without the church itself. Here there is a danger of equating Christian service too closely with recognised activities in the ecclesiastical set-up, so identifying Christian action with churchiness. It is tempting, when the faithful are few, to expect the young to put all their energies into the Sunday School or week-night organisation and so keep the show going, but other

spheres of action—in local and national politics, for instance—must be set before them, and the decision must be theirs. One would like to see churches recognising this 'outside' service by commissioning their young members to go forth into various spheres, linking their churchmanship closely to their public service. If Christian strategy demands it, we must be prepared to simplify church organisation and look outwards.

In the last analysis, the integrity of the individual rests on his willingness to come to a decision alone in his heart on the meaning of life, and to respond for himself to the challenge of truth from without. No one can educate the young into commitment; they must take this step for themselves through the grace of God. Right through the whole pattern of community life training in understanding and opportunity for commitment must be given, but at the heart of it all is the response of the individual out of his solitariness.

CHAPTER VI

YOUNG PEOPLE IN A MASS SOCIETY

CLEARLY we are uneasy about the 'good-time boys and girls' of today. But neither denunciation in newspapers nor governmental plans for rescue are of any use unless we see that the fault is *ours—that we have not given them the kind of experience outlined above.*

Educationally speaking, the most serious thing that has happened in this century has been the breakdown of true societies. We have made many significant advances in conceptions and techniques of education, but steadily the pattern of really personal societies and groupings has vanished. In place of strong family units, neighbourhoods of fairly stable population and traditional social life, thriv-

ing churches, chapels, cultural groups, trade union branches, etc., and economic units of all sizes, with a predominance of small businesses, we now have huge and shifting masses of people, gathered in vast housing estates to sleep, in vast factories to work, and in vast cinemas for their social life. The characteristic of present-day life is *size*: the metropolis, the chain-store, the mass-producing factory suck the life-blood from all smaller concerns, and there is a constant bias towards everything large-scale. The only way to handle a large mass of people is to departmentalise rigidly and subject them to mass regimentation. The logical opposite is to let them loose in a maelstrom of warring atoms. Both experiences are true today. In the midst of the masses the individual is more alone than ever before: he is a unit, a number, one of a category or a crowd—not a person. Above all, common social purposes have failed.

All this has been analysed many times. What we have now to examine are the implications of this mass-society for the young. They no longer grow to maturity within the life of true social units. In the first place, the family has lost much of its significance and in many cases has almost broken down as an educating society. The evolution of the family from the early clan stage to the modern 'biological unit' has been long and complex. Bit by bit it has been shorn of its function. The legal authority of the *pater familias* over the lives and property of the kin has long since passed away, but until the Industrial Revolution the family survived in England as an economic unit. It rested on a property basis, and in different levels of society the family estate or farm, the family business or workshop was the typical unit of production, from which its members, working side by side, drew a joint living. Many factors combined to destroy this economic bond, and today the family scatters daily to different jobs for which each member is paid individually. The pooling of resources

and family budgeting may still be found where traditional ways linger, as in mining villages, but elsewhere the individual manages his own money, and the young are emancipated from parental control as soon as they are economically independent. This was accentuated in the period of depression by the topsy-turvy situation in which younger members supported the unemployed older ones. The working of the Means Test tended to scatter the family, and in the war period families were broken up not only through military service, but also through direction to work. Mobility of labour is at the expense of family stability. The family as a centre for social amusement has been declining ever since the advent of commercial mass-entertainment, so that now, for many of the young home is only an hotel in which to sleep and (sometimes) eat.

The most obvious function of the family has always been the upbringing, care, and protection of children, yet, in the very period in which we have been learning to treat them more sensitively, the family has been losing its supreme place in this work. The State has intervened to enforce standards of health and hygiene, food and clothing, education and control, where parents cannot or will not maintain these themselves. Not that public authorities have deliberately pursued a policy of superseding the family—in the 1944 Education Act the *legal* responsibility of the parent is widened, not narrowed—but inevitably the zealous administrator, teacher, doctor, or nurse, in pursuit of the ideal standard, will brush on one side weak and inefficient parents, with the implication, if not the words: "We can do the job better." This again has been accentuated in war-time by State policy with regard to woman-power. Here the implied argument is: "We can cut down on the craft of motherhood by providing nurseries, school-meals, etc., to handle large numbers at once, but we need all women as 'hands' in the war effort." Finally, in war-

time even the primary function of the family to protect its young physically was denied to it. The child's natural protectors, living in vulnerable areas, had to see the State assuming control and evacuating their children they knew not whither. The fierce emotional conflicts which this violation of a primitive bond aroused in both parents and children have been well portrayed in evacuation surveys. In other cases, air-raids turned home-life into shelter-life, a tragic parody of the family community.

One wonders at times whether the family *as a society* can possibly survive all these blows. And yet, constantly, the war threw up emotional situations which revealed how deep and enduring were family ties and how stubbornly the members clung together. Over against the cases in which evacuation was seized as a chance to throw off the children, there were innumerable instances in which parents would not let their children go, or fetched them back. Danger so often aroused the fundamental instinct of the family to stick together.

The problem of the violent family break-up is very pressing. Unfaithful parents, divided homes, and marital tangles created by the war, the absence of father in the army and mother at work, neglect or abandonment in evacuation—these and other violent experiences are producing their inevitable fruits in the deep-seated fears and insecurities of the young. So many cases which find their way either to Child Guidance Clinics or Juvenile Courts are traced back to a family breakdown. Many people understand this, but fail to see that far more widespread than the families where some patent and obvious failure has occurred are *those which are failing to be truly educative societies.* Superficially they look quite successful but in fact they are failing in the true business of nurture. Perhaps the root of this failure lies in the cult of individualism which, taking its origin in the Renaissance

period, has gradually permeated the whole of modern society. Now abandoned, in the main, by educationalists, this doctrine has seeped through into common thought, to appear in the protestations of so many parents that "I never say No to my child" or that "I always let my child do as he likes". Thus the final phase of individualism has been working its disastrous way through family life in the period since the 1914 war. Many parents, in sincere revolt against the rigidity of earlier family law, have honestly thought it wrong to interfere with a child in any way, lest they broke his spirit and denied his freedom. Of course there was much good in this emphasis on the sanctity of the child's personality and new sensitivity to his needs. But the advocates of freedom have failed to see that the burden of freedom can be too great unless it is wisely limited. Moreover, all those who subscribe to 'free discipline' are not so disinterested. To teach a child the family law patiently and consistently, and to design a family order for the good of children as well as adults, is a much more exacting task than to 'let 'em have their own way'. The cult of individualism can easily be a cloak for the self-indulgence of adults who do not want to undertake that disciplining of themselves which is so necessary in the disciplining of children. "Why should I give up my own life for the children?" they ask. Under such conditions family life soon becomes nothing but the claim and counter-claim of vociferous individuals, clamouring one against the other. So the children rush around, giving unrestrained vent to their impulses until they cut across adult interests too badly and then they are either slapped for being naughty or cajoled with sweets according to the mood of the moment. Small wonder that in adolescence they pursue their own interests in complete disregard of the family! By that time all possibility of family guidance has vanished: "I'm grown-up—I can do what I like," says the girl of fifteen with a toss of the head, and her words

stand as an epitaph to the family community. If the situation becomes desperate and a drastic application of discipline is necessary, the school or the police court has to be called in. The following true conversation is illuminating:

> *Irate Person:* "Mrs. ——, your boy has just flung a stone through the window, narrowly missing my head. What are you going to do about it?"
>
> *Mother:* "*Me?* That's nothing to do with me! That's the school's job!"

Does the school really take up the job so confidently thrown on it by some parents? Of course there are many shining examples of schools which do give a true social experience, just as there are many true homes, but the inescapable fact is that the demand for popular education confronted authorities with an impossible task: given such large masses to be dealt with on such inadequate financial resources, regimentation is the only possible law. Large classes are an inevitable economy, large schools a way of combining efficiency and economy. In one factory-like building are gathered hundreds of children, sorted into departments and then graded again for attainment into A, B, C, and even D streams. Because our public system of education was shaped at a period when stress was laid on the intellectual content of education rather than on character-training, the characteristic activities of our elementary and secondary schools have been intellectual drills conducted under some form of mass discipline. Certainly in the years just prior to the war this was ceasing to be true. Increasingly, one could find in schools spontaneous yet orderly movement, free co-operative enterprises, a real sense of social community. These developments go on, but the post-war period has thrown into alarming prominence the inadequate supply of teachers, and now in the

reconstruction period plans for extended schooling make large institutions almost inevitable. In so many cases, the school has not so much broken down as a community, but has never had a chance to become one. In some ways the all-age village school has had the best chance, and some delightful examples exist in rural areas. This, however, puts an impossible burden on the staff. It was to lighten this and give the seniors more adequate instruction that rural reorganisation was devised, yet the gathering of older children into one bigger centre has often crippled the village school as a community. Thus, to some degree, the function of the school as a society has stood in opposition to its function as a purveyor of knowledge.

Perhaps the most obvious and disastrous breakdown of true social groups has been in the neighbourhood. Of course in various parts of the country ancient communities keep their traditional forms, and even embedded deep in the vastness of London certain ancient streets and districts, mostly in slum areas, maintain their corporate identity.[1] In a stable environment the plant of neighbourliness may still bear fruit in mutual help and social tradition, but how often has it been uprooted or smothered in our large cities and industrial towns, in suburban housing estates, in war-time colonies springing up round new factories in rural areas! Here are huge agglomerations of people, plucked from traditional communities and flung together in vast estates that seem to have no pattern, centre or organisation, but just go on and on. The two characteristic forms of housing today are the huge, monotonous working-class estate which stifles neighbourliness by its impersonality, and the better-class suburb in which architectural individualism runs riot, and within each little box one family keeps itself to itself. Thus people are sorted into class

[1] The individualist suburban decorations for the last Coronation, as against the co-operative schemes of some East End streets, showed where bits of true community still survived.

districts, and, like the over-graded school, the over-graded housing estate fails to give the young a true experience of 'mixed community'. Population shifts continually, so that neighbours cannot gain mutual confidence, and none of the conditions for a slow-growing local community, centring in common interests, seem to be present. Neighbourliness is not a plant which transplants easily, yet increasingly economic planning may require the shifting of herds of people at short intervals. This rootless, unhistorical character of present-day societies defeats true education.

It is easy to see how in an atmosphere of hugeness and impersonality voluntary societies wither and die. For the last few decades the cry has been "People aren't keen enough to join anything." The principle of voluntary association, which has produced in this country such an astonishing medley of societies, has more and more become confined to an active minority. Taking people in general, they will not join political parties or become active trade-unionists and they do not care about educational or cultural societies. Those great training schools in the democratic management of affairs, the chapel, the trade union and the co-op, no longer touch the mass of workers, and what they have missed in experience of committee-work, public speaking and responsible leadership is patently obvious to anyone who tries to form out of the scattered elements of a new housing estate a proper Community Centre Committee. Scope for personal development through true social activity is immeasurably contracted, and the young get no stimulus from the example of their adult friends to join a society. This means that, instead of a gradually widening circle of social contacts, they are thrown out into the mass experience of the street. Here, instead of true societies, are gangs of boys and girls drifting about in ever-changing, superficial relations, and the promiscuity of this life offers little chance for building up real friendships or

lasting social groups; it leads instead to the cinema and the dance-hall, and the amusements they provide. This disastrous experience of being flung into the street for their social life is not often grasped by middle-class folk, because their way of life still provides the young with outgoing social avenues through voluntary groups, and homes in which they can entertain their own friends. These opportunities are denied to poorer families. Possibly the whole notion of a breakdown of voluntary societies may be contested by middle-class readers who can point to an increase in associations of all kinds over the last two or three decades. The point is that nearly all these have an unmistakably middle-class flavour and are supported by those with social aspirations. There is, however, the interesting phenomenon of a real recrudescence of spontaneous groups during the war. This was partly bound up with the much more active neighbourliness which danger produces, and the question now is whether the impulse to social groupings can survive the special war-time sense of solidarity.

The breakdown of the Church as the most significant local society carries us back to very fundamental changes which it is not possible to analyse here. For the majority the Church has ceased to be a society of persons, and has become simply a place to which some people go. The multiplication of denominations emphasises this, so that the outsider's impression of the Church is of a multiplicity of churches and chapels scattered about the town, very much like cinemas and pubs. His attitude might be expressed thus: some folk choose this place of entertainment and some that, but, judging by the audiences, churches and chapels are very inferior places of amusement. The behaviour of most congregations does little to dispel this impression: individuals issue forth from the self-contained boxes of their own lives, come to hear their pet preacher, and go home again. 'The Church' equals Building plus Parson, and the whole conception of the Church as the

committed fellowship of those who serve God in this neighbourhood has been lost. This change is particularly marked in the case of the Free Churches where, in the past, the active management of church affairs in the church meeting, and the social intercourse of tea-meetings and other activities, were always an integral part of churchmanship, so that the worship of the Church on Sunday was that of a real fellowship of persons. Of course some churches have kept the note of fellowship, but it is often a little forced and anxious, and the hard fact is that the real lay leadership usually devolves on a few and that church socials offer few attractions to the sophisticated taste of the cinema-goer. The true mixed community is a rarity, for, as a rule, the church is either forced to take on a class colour when its district becomes all working-class or all professional, or its workers drift away and it settles down into a comfortable middle-class group. A most disastrous development is the growing custom of using Sunday Schools and youth organisations as convenient dumping grounds for children, without any relation to the real meaning of the Church. A Sunday School full of children and a church empty of adults is a parody of church life which is all too common. In such cases Sunday School does not introduce the young to the Church; it is a 'kid's game' which you leave when you leave day school and grow up. No normal adult of your acquaintance has any use for church-going. So the whole idea of the Church as an all-age society which you enter with your family is lost.

The experience of the young, then, is of *masses*—in street, factory, cinema, dance-hall and so forth—rather than of *groups*. This makes it increasingly difficult for them to gain that fundamental experience of understanding the whole and grasping their significant part in it. Precisely at this point guidance in the meaning of life fails them and their experience becomes one of chaos. The size and complexity of the city certainly makes the task

difficult, for adults themselves are swamped and how can a child who has never got to the end of London grasp the pattern of his community? But so often the task is not even attempted, either in family or in school. In spite of outstanding exceptions, the school curriculum usually consists of 'subjects' which offer no clear explanation of the kind of life the children are entering upon, and often appear to bear no relation to it whatsoever. The school is not the interpreter of the environment, and for many children their school teachers are far too remote from everyday life to help them.

Then at fourteen (or, we hope, at fifteen) the boy or girl is flung down a precipice, as it were, into the maelstrom of work. Overnight he must grow up. He must not only stand up to the new physical strains imposed, but put on adult habits and conversation, and conform to the customs and standards of his new group. He probably gets the minimum of instruction in his job and no personal guidance at all. As a rule no attempt is made to present to him the whole pattern of the industry in vivid, meaningful terms. Sometimes he does not even know what he is making (as the evidence of the war-time Registration of Youth showed), and all too seldom has he any understanding of his part in the whole. His work is only a necessary evil to be endured in order to achieve the pay-packet. The haphazard way in which the adolescent tumbles into his first job clearly illustrates the absence of true guidance. He usually goes for quick money rather than future training, and the community, because it needs cheap labour, allows him to be put into dead-end jobs and unskilled monotonous processes, thus wasting recklessly the greatest treasure for the future. The evils of this chance experience have been aggravated in the past by the violent extremes of our unplanned economy, for at the opposite ends of the pole, unemployment, on the one hand, and, on the other, a scarcity value which raises wages abnormally and encourages continual

shifting, have been profoundly bad experiences for the young. Above all, their work so often calls for no initiative or responsibility, and a growing sense of futility hangs over it like a pall. The experience of work brings, not increased personal significance, but sheer disillusionment. The obvious failure here is that of true adult guidance, but beneath it lies the fatal rift between daily work and significant living which is the mark of a diseased civilisation. We shall never educate young workers properly so long as we let them 'earn a living' for the major part of the day in order that they may *live* in the remaining bit.

We cannot be a truly educating community unless deep common values and purposes are implicit in our way of life. It is the clash of values in our society which, in the last analysis, has created confusion for the young. What are our objectives in life? Are there any commonly held 'goods' or basic assumptions in our society? The war provided us with certain common purposes, but do we now really know where we are going as a nation? There are, in fact, many opposing voices raised to guide the young and many clashing experiences to teach them different values. Some put forward various political 'goods', some turn for salvation to science or to social security. But the deepest clash is not so much between the consciously opposed prophets of a new order, as between the kind of values still inculcated through school, club, church and national pronouncements, and the unconscious assumptions behind ordinary experiences today. Consider the life of the young in any great industrial city: the conversations and choices of the home; the life of street and shops, with its clamour and competition; the cinema, glorifying pleasure, glamour, sensation; advertisements enticing you to acquire more things; attitudes and conversations of factory, office, shop. What values are they imbibing from this mass-producing civilisation? Here are a few typical attitudes:

1. The natural world exists solely to be exploited by men. Smash and grab is the only law.

2. The happiest person is he who has the most material possessions; the chief satisfaction in life is to get and get, more and more.

3. The law of the world is competition: the only sensible way to act is to get on, climb up, and push someone else down.

4. Work is a nuisance to be avoided by every device possible: the farther up the tree you climb the less work you do, whilst the 'big toff' at the top of the tree does no work at all.

5. The powers that rule this world—known as 'they'—are untrustworthy and arbitrary, to be tricked and outwitted as often, and obeyed as seldom, as possible.

Such assumptions meet the young on every side. Yet they are not the values to which we give lip-service in our national life, they are not the avowed ideals of schools and clubs, and when in the midst of the materialist voices the young hear the voice of the Church upraised, it is saying the exact opposite:

1. The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof.

2. It is more blessed to give than to receive.

3. We are members one of another.

4. He that is greatest among you let him be the servant of all.

5. God rules this world and God is Love.

For some there is no great clash: when the values of ordinary life conflict with those of the Church, the former win hands down, and the conclusion is that the Christian faith is just irrelevant to real life. But the rub lies in the fact that we are still a semi-Christian country. We have set forth unmistakably in our educational policy our intention that the Christian faith shall be taught to the

young; our Service of Youth policy is closely allied to religious aims (albeit rather vague ones); whilst religious parades and national days of prayer show our general intention to maintain an amiable contact with the Christian God. There is sufficient contact with religion in the experience of most young people for them to have, at least, a sneaking feeling that 'there may be something in this Christian business', and, at most, an unhappy sense of the conflict between fair-spoken ideals and real life.

This is a downright wicked state of affairs. No community is fit to bring up its young unless it seeks to express *right through its common life* a set of values which becomes explicit in the religious teaching given. Our hypocrisy in family life, where God is found so useful for christenings, weddings and funerals, is matched by our hypocrisy in time of national crisis. For we have lost the true relation between fundamental beliefs and everyday choices. Our deepest failure as a community is that we can give the young no faith for living. It is at bottom a failure of the Church, not just of its professional leaders, but of all its adult lay members who have failed to maintain the true link between theology and life. Christian teaching is presented to the young either in terms of general ethical rules (be kind, tell the truth and so on), or in the language of classical theology which seems irrelevant to their real problems. We fail in the crucial task of an educating community—that of reinterpreting its faith in terms of present-day situations and concrete choices. A living faith must find expression, not in a dead code of behaviour or a formal theology, but in spontaneous action which is the embodiment of ultimate purpose in concrete terms. We are not challenging the next generation to this kind of commitment because in our everyday social life we embody no great faith for living.

Chaotic experience and clash of purposes have created a deep insecurity, a fear of life and what it may do to you.

When conflict becomes unbearable one way out is to put on protective armour, and so the young today put on the armour of sophistication which so often prevents us from seeing behind the façade the frightened and insecure adolescent. The boy and girl who in the comparative shelter of school could be eager, responsive and inquiring, come back to visit soon after entering work preening themselves in adult clothes and make-up, full of adult mannerisms, and well-hidden beneath a thick layer of hard-boiledness. They have already decided that there is no great meaning in life, that no purpose is worth pursuing except immediate pleasure and quick returns in sensation. They avoid value-judgments, and will not admit absolute standards: "If he chooses to live that way, he must like it and that's good enough." "What about Bing Crosby? I reckon he's as successful as your Mme Curie. He's a tip-top crooner, he gives people pleasure and he's rich. What more do you want?"—these are typical remarks taken from a discussion on "What makes life worthwhile." They do not care about work nor embrace causes, and they are bored by activity. Capacity for effort and enthusiasm and experiment seems to be dying just when it should be developing. Our young people tend to go dead just when they should be coming most alive.

Of course this description is not true of all. Moreover, in the war years we were preserved because so many gave themselves wholeheartedly to the purposes set before them. But remove these war-time objectives—is it not true now that, on the whole, we are bringing up a generation of 'agnostics', that is, of people unwilling or unable to embrace a belief, not only with the *mind,* but with the *will,* people who cannot commit themselves to any long-term belief as a basis for action, but are blown hither and thither by every passing wind of desire or sensation? Are we not, in fact, letting the young grow up into slavery?

CHAPTER VII

CREATING COMMUNITY

THE intention of this book has been to show that education is bound up with every aspect of social life. It is therefore useless for educationalists to set out by themselves to provide an ideal system of education. Planning in the fields of town lay-out and housing, of health and social security, of location and organisation of industry will be as significant in the upbringing of the young as that of the Ministry of Education. The number and quality of the cinemas will be as important as the schools. Technical judgments must always be made by experts in a particular field, but we can demand that they shall pursue objectives approved by the whole community. The contention here is that one of our major objectives should be the right upbringing of the next generation, and that in every field of social planning *one* of the main questions to be asked is: How will this affect the experience of the *young*? This at once raises the issue of priorities in values, for reconstruction policies will not be simple questions of good or bad, but of one 'good' against another. The aim of full employment, for example, may necessitate great mobility of labour. If this is carried out without regard for human values, it may be disastrous for the growth of children who need homes, not only materially secure, but rooted in a known and friendly community where the traditional pattern of life centres round settled industries. Obviously security of employment is necessary to a stable home, but we must not lose the subtler values in pursuing material ends. At any rate, if we can lay upon the con-

sciences of *all* citizens the responsibility for considering how social planning influences the young, we shall indeed become an educating community. In such one of the functions of the educationalist will be to point out the effects of various experiences on the young, and to stimulate the community to decide what it really does want to pass on to the next generation. In this chapter are gathered some suggestions on the kind of educational ends we should pursue in community life. Some must be seen in relation to legislation, or central and local planning; others must be achieved in quite different ways. Behind them lie the great political issues of our social order.

Is the family to be written off as a major casualty, or should its recovery be a main plank in our programme? We must make up our minds on this. It is the writer's conviction that a proper family life is the only basis for a true education and that, if we do nothing else, we must revive this fundamental society. There is much sentimental talk of family life, but in actual fact, when the claims of the family clash with the needs of labour or standards of efficiency, do we respect it? The family so often appears to the expert as an amateur affair, getting in the way of tidy plans. Of course basic standards in the care of children must be enforced in the sense that, below a certain point, the State must take action. But we must beware lest we pursue physical well-being to the detriment of emotional and spiritual: it is often better to work more slowly through the parents than to achieve through the school a standard which is in opposition to the home. The findings of the Curtis Report on children in institutions brought out clearly the need for spiritual as well as physical nourishment, and the fact that this cannot be given unless such institutions provide an experience as close as possible to family life.[1] If we really believe this,

[1] A war-time experiment, involving the transfer of about twenty very backward institution children, aged about two or three, to a country-house,

the first essential is a clear recognition of the true relation between the State, with its army of bureaucrats and experts, and this supremely amateur institution to which we entrust the nurture of the young. We need, in fact, administrators and professionals who will regard it as one of their chief functions *to put across to parents the plans they make,* making every effort to work through the family, spending time and thought on explaining and popularising policy, and only as a last resort brushing parents aside to act in their stead. Evacuation experience afforded a useful contrast between good and bad official attitudes, and the evidence suggests that it was most successful where a careful liaison between home and school was maintained and the imponderable factor of family attitude received full consideration. The practical conclusions to be drawn are that the Ministry of Education should have a good propaganda department, that Local Education Authorities should have good 'public relations officers',[1] that more parents should be school managers and members of local education committees, and that home and school associations and contacts of various kinds should be regarded as a vital school activity. *All* schools need whole- or part-time secretaries, and class-teachers as well as heads should have time and a place in which to meet parents.

We need a clear policy on the relation of the nursery-school to the family. The war-time growth of nursery provision of many types helped greatly to bring the claims of the 'under-fives' before the public, but inevitably nurseries have appeared as substitutes for home-life, provided

threw into startling prominence the importance of nourishing children in a true family group. The hostess turned her house into their home, became their 'Mummy Di,' and transformed their life into a real family one. After five years their personal development appeared almost miraculous, and practically all were shown to be normal in intelligence and social adjustment.

[1] A Director of Education who spent two hours meeting a Women's Institute deputation had obviously grasped this point. So also has the L.E.A. which addresses a personal letter to parents at each stage of a child's education.

to free women for industry. Hence the champions of the family are apt to oppose the peace-time campaign for 'nursery-schools for all'. On the other hand, some unwise enthusiasts for the cause imply in their arguments that homes are hopeless and that the salvation of the under-fives lies in a general provision of nursery-schools. Both extremes give a wrong emphasis, and it will be a disaster for the children if we find ourselves involved in a home *v.* nursery-school tussle. The two must not be seen as rivals: as we have said, the nursery-school is not a substitute for the home but the first step from it. If the whole adventure of living in communities is to be a happy one, we need nursery-schools as a part-foundation for social living. The most delicate part of nursery-school policy is the establishment of a proper relation between home and school. This means a limitation of school hours to leave room for a proper home life, easy contact of parents with the school, and, above all, a realisation on the part of the teacher that her job is to help parents in every way and not to supersede them.

Home-making may be called the great amateur business, but perhaps more soundly, the great profession for which everyone should receive some training. We do not teach with nearly enough conviction and interest what a many-sided and worthy profession it is. This must be done in different ways at different levels. In school there may be courses in home-furnishing, housewifery, cooking and child-care, not only for girls but for boys too. Lately, realistic and exciting ways of doing this have developed apace, but experiment is still needed in linking up aspects of homecraft to scientific knowledge, in training taste through exhibitions and discussions on colour-schemes, fabrics, etc., and in relating practical considerations to values. This question of formulating aims and values in family life needs particularly to be tackled through discussions in clubs among boys and girls beginning to think

seriously about marriage. A discussion with girls, for instance, on 'My Ideal Home' can begin with all the gadgets and furnishings, but go on to 'What kind of family life do I want?' Thus some implications of family responsibility can be faced. This is one of the points where the Church must act far more decisively than in the past. In discussions of young people, in the preparation of those whom it marries, in help provided for young parents, the Church must tackle problems of the Christian home much more frankly and concretely than it has done. Two points to be stressed are, that 'religion in the home' is expressed in all the everyday affairs of family life, and that it is the duty of the family to bring up children in a definite faith and way of life. We must in every way oppose the heresy that children should be left to do as they like. Advice to parents on the psychological level needs to be made more available: the help of child-guidance clinics on the emotional needs of children should not be reserved for extreme tangles but available for all at welfare clinics; schools and other local organisations should arrange simple psychological courses. The Church should provide real guidance in this field, but the old type of mothers' meeting will not meet the need. We want clubs for fathers and mothers which will discuss practical issues in the upbringing of children and relate these, on the one hand, to psychological principles, and, on the other, to the Christian doctrine of Man. The kind of questions to be tackled are: When should one say No to a child and why? What are the signs that a child is starved of love? How much should parents sacrifice their own interests to the children?

All these issues connect closely with housing. This is a post-war problem of great complexity, but for all its difficulty we must not lose sight of the major requirement *that a house should be a place where a family society can flourish*. Ideally, this would suggest houses rather than

flats,[1] gardens or backyards where possible, and a generous enough provision of rooms to give children a playroom (or at least a space) of their own, and adolescents privacy for their own possessions and a place to entertain their friends freely. We shall not get anywhere near this at present—to achieve a decent minimal standard in sleeping-space will be a mighty effort—but we need architects who will think in terms of living family societies, and social advisers, e.g. house-property managers, to help the home-makers use their rooms educationally.

The whole subject of children's play deserves the attention of parents, churches, school and community. When the prophet declared: "And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing," he saw truly that children's play is the saving health of the community, and that the pattern which these small creatures make, skipping in and out among us on their own delightful business, is woven in golden threads through the social fabric. It is supremely important to the community that children should have rich and satisfying materials for play—*raw materials for their own play,* not ready-made amusement in the form of expensive and elaborate toys, or people to organise activities. They need the fundamental satisfaction of playing with elemental things—earth, water, clay, wood, etc.; they need varied and suggestive play materials out of which they can improvise, devise, imagine, creating dizzy castles of the spirit on the slenderest resources. We had nearly forfeited the joy of watching spontaneous, imaginative play, for, in the pre-war multitude of intricate, expensive toys, true play was steadily degenerating into mere satisfaction of possession. Surely the beginning of the materialist obsession to acquire things lies in the experience of small children trailed round Woolworth's or Selfridge's, until, out

[1] "The fact is that working-class families prefer a house with a garden. . . . To educate people to live in flats was wrong. . . . Experience at Welwyn has shown that flat-dwellings should be 5% to 10% of the total." Reiss, in *Country Towns in the Future England* (1944), p. 79.

of sheer boredom, they clamour for this or that toy and happiness comes to be measured in terms of the most elaborate, often the least satisfying, one? We must get across to parents the principles of true play, by exhibitions of good play materials, by films, and by practical discussions. Where proper scope for play is lacking, we must provide play-centres which give children space, materials, and leaders who will not organise, but watch, suggest, help. It is most important that these centres should not be too large, as so many are today. A horde of small children pouring into the centre quickly becomes an animal rabble, snatching, destroying, quarrelling, but children trickling in a few at a time easily form spontaneous groups, playing at shop, or houses, or trains, and so receive a vital social experience. Ideally the centre should have a number of rooms, with different types of play materials in each; if there is only one room, different 'corners' must be arranged so that groups form naturally. Parents can help by making equipment and assisting to run the centre. Finally, there is need to develop children's libraries, and to advise parents over children's reading. A successful idea is that of a 'book-corner' in school, where children and parents can see the best books for all ages, and order them through the school. There is a great chance here for the churches, too, so long as there is no artificial concentration on 'religious' books, but *all* children's reading is regarded as of equal importance.

When we move beyond the home into the sphere of neighbourhood and town-planning, of population movements, of location of industries and rural reconstruction, the issues are vast indeed. In town-planning we need to break up large masses into basic neighbourhood units which are small enough to be assimilated by the young, have a pattern and a centre, and give an experience of 'mixed community'. In this age of specialisation a truly balanced neighbourhood is most difficult to achieve, yet it

is just this acquaintance with differing functions and mutual service—an experience of the world in microcosm—that the child most needs. Housing units need to be in easy contact with the country in order to bring children into touch with the basic natural processes on which town and country alike are built. We need "balanced urban communities within balanced regions: on the one hand, a wider diffusion of the instruments and processes of a high human culture, and on the other the infusion into the city of the life-sustaining environment and life-directed interests of the countryside." [1]

When we turn to the school it is clear that knotty problems of organisation and numbers confront those who carry out the new policy. Large schools, large classes, systematic grading and thorough departmentalisation seem essential if reforms are to be quickly implemented. Yet we must be on our guard against mass-production 'education factories', for our deepest task is to challenge 'giantism' and every form of mass discipline. Here the demands of efficiency may easily conflict with the true aims of social education. Obviously we cannot expect much reduction in the size of classes at present, but it is still true that no single reform would do more to establish a true community education in schools than the reduction of all classes to a maximum of twenty-five. It is a great pity that in the 1944 replanning of education this issue was treated as a matter for administrative rather than legislative action, and so there was no chance for what one might call a national declaration of belief in small societies as necessary for the true upbringing of persons. Probably the important things to press for now are the splitting up of large units into small ones (e.g. the class of forty into small working groups), and the formation of different kinds of groups which cross-fertilise age groups and grades. Thus the inevitably large size of the multilateral school must be

[1] Mumford, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

countered by the vitality of the groups within it. For rural schools the most knotty problem is how far away from home one must remove the over-elevens to provide a proper 'secondary' education. The rural community suffers if they are swept off to the town, and the children themselves are artificially cut off from their proper life. The best policy is probably to gather them into the most central of a group of villages and there provide a properly equipped post-primary institution, perhaps of the Village College type. This, however, is less economic than drawing them from the larger 'catchment area' served by the nearest town. All such problems must be dealt with in local terms. What matters is that in all our reorganisation *the true qualities of a community education should be weighed against the efficient organisation of numbers.*

We need a new approach to the curriculum. 'Does it help the child to interpret his world? Does it help him to stand in other people's shoes?' By asking such questions we must test what we teach. Apart from the skills we call tool subjects, the curriculum needs to be compounded of two opposite elements: environment study, and the feeding and training of the imagination. These interact, but teachers need to be alive to the element of paradox contained in these opposites—that the young need both to understand their immediate world and to escape from it by the paths of imagination. Much thought and experiment is required here. Above all, teachers must understand that an attitude to life and a scale of values underlies the teaching of every subject, making all teaching 'religious'. In the teaching of Scripture to younger children much advance has been made, but for older ones 'agreed syllabuses' tend sometimes to encourage a cut-and-dried method of putting across tidy bits of information instead of linking Christianity with the interpretation of life and of the world around. The pattern of the scheme should often follow the experience of the children them-

selves—e.g. an explanation of differing churches in the locality, an interpretation of the things in the parish church or of church-services, a study of great Christian festivals. This work culminates in broad discussions which link everyday experience on the one hand and widening conceptions gained from studies on the other, to the Christian faith as the keystone of the arch. A very promising recent experiment has been that of local conferences for the upper forms of secondary schools, organised on an inter-school and inter-denominational basis by the Student Christian Movement (Schools Department) and the Federation of University Women's Camps for Schoolgirls, with the co-operation of local school authorities.

Much has to be done to link the school properly with the local community. Schools are still regarded as withdrawn places, unfamiliar and forbidding to the general public, pursuing artificial activities out of touch with the real world. We have to make them outgoing centres of exploration. There must be a genuine coming and going, of school children going out to ask questions, collect data and watch processes, of adults coming in to give expert talks, demonstrate techniques, and also themselves to ask questions and seek help. Above all, the folk of the neighbourhood must feel the school to be *their* school, pursuing activities they appreciate and in which they participate, often acting as their experimental 'research' station. This can be especially true of rural schools where experiments for the community are already a common feature. If day school merges by a natural transition into evening activities of adults, then the school indeed belongs to the whole community. But once again we must maintain the paradox in education: integration with the community must be balanced by proper encouragement of withdrawn-ness, and the objectives of remote, academic learning and solitary pursuits must be given their proper place.

The question of the school and the community is really

at the root of our present problem of how to find enough teachers of the right quality. Many factors, which we need not here specify, contribute to the present unwillingness to take up teaching. Some of these are already being tackled, but at the root of them all there lies one fundamental one: the anomalous position of the teacher in the community. Teachers are neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring, but curious beings, avoided by the rest, and regarded as unable to enjoy a normal social life. A Women's Institute secretary is said to have reported her committee as consisting of 'six ladies, six women, and the school-mistress'. It is interesting to notice that Americans do not isolate their teachers thus, and the prejudice is, of course, unfair where the majority of teachers are concerned. It reflects, in fact, our mistaken notion of a gulf between education and the community. If we are all educators, then teachers are only those specially deputed to carry out a responsibility in which *all* are engaged. When we have really grasped the conception of the educating community, then we may allow the teacher to descend from his little pedestal (which, alas, some enjoy, to their undoing), and be treated as a normal adult with a healthy life of his own. The other side to this is the added personal significance gained by the ordinary adult who is called on to impart his own special skill or wisdom to someone less experienced than himself. Educating is one of the worthiest of human activities, and a nation in which many adults share this work with professional teachers will be immensely enriched.

Problems of teacher-training are too intricate to discuss here, but if we ask ourselves what kind of persons we want as the teachers of our children, the answer must surely be: normal adults, alive in interest and mature in development, enjoying a wide experience and living a full, well-rounded life. To achieve this we must make transfers in and out of the profession easy, encourage folk with

certain other types of experience to do a spell of teaching, and be prepared to admit such on grounds of special qualities and experience instead of the all-sufficient certificate or degree. Most important of all, we need as teachers people of conviction who have honestly built up their philosophy of life (or are in process of so doing), and have embraced a faith which is a basis for action. This does not mean a complete or static faith; the vital quality is willingness to take one's stand *somewhere,* albeit experimentally, rather than to sit forever on the fence above the conflicts, in strict non-commitment. This will entail freedom in private life to plunge into the mêlée of religious or political controversy, but the young need contact with persons of conviction and enthusiasm, and we must face the risks involved. It is, however, vitally important that those who teach should understand the nature of their influence over the young, and the fundamental difference between using it to enslave and using it to set free. Their greatest function is *to help the young to make their own commitments to the truth they see for themselves.* This idea of exercising the influence of conviction in order to make the young free is only fully grasped in the Christian doctrine of Man. The Church, therefore, must play a vital part in training teachers, both by helping them to clarify their own convictions, and by showing them true objectives in education.

For most young people the transition stage to adult life will be one of work plus part-time schooling. It is difficult to write of County Colleges at this stage. The main problem will be the proper use of available time. One day a week is quite inadequate, but it will be impossible at present to come near the ideal standard of half-time schooling in the first year at least. County Colleges must, however, seek right from the beginning to define their real tasks. They have to form a proper bridge into adult life, and to do this adequately five tasks may be distinguished.

First, they have to develop physical powers and keep an oversight of health, with special regard to the effects of work. Secondly, they have to train for and interpret the new field of work, both technically and in its wider implications. Thirdly, they have to open up a wide range of adult interests—cultural, artistic, practical—to furnish resources for a full use of leisure. Fourthly, they must interpret the widening field of citizenship. Lastly, they must tackle this great and continual task of opening up the meanings and implications of life, and helping to formulate values and a faith. There is needed on the time-table a period which can be variously used for discussions starting from everyday problems and choices (e.g. in the spheres of personal relations, use of money and material possessions, work, leisure, etc.) and working back to ultimate issues, or for definite courses, for example, on Science and Religion, the Making of the Bible, God in History, the Expansion of the Church.[1] Such a period would be best not labelled Scripture, nor treated in any way suggestive of formal religious instruction. The problem will be to fit in all that is needed, and it will be fatally easy to reduce the curriculum to two or three aspects—physical, technical, cultural—all kept in watertight compartments. Yet if there is no opportunity to examine the meaning of life in wholeness, a great chance will be lost, just when the adolescent is facing new problems. Possibilities for informal discussion are much greater in residential colleges, where for a definite period a group of people live and think together, educating each other in a thousand subtle ways.

Nothing has been said in this book about boarding-schools, because it is concerned with the education of the majority, and it may be assumed that complete boarding-school education for the masses is not practicable. More-

[1] Suggested material for such discussions is contained in *Getting Things Straight*, a pamphlet which can be obtained from the Christian Auxiliary Movement, Annandale, North End Road, London, N.W.11.

over, implicit in the view that true education means growing up in a variety of societies, there lies a recognition of the danger of an education which enwraps the young too completely in one community, away from all others. But without entering into the question whether whole-time boarding-school education is, or is not, bad for the few who get it, the writer may here express the belief that education in a residential school or college for some period as an adolescent or young adult would be of fundamental value—the very embodiment of education in community, opening up to many more experiences prized by university students. In the midst of the variety of societies, and the present clash of values, to be withdrawn *for a while* into a community based upon a coherent and worthy philosophy of life, in which experience is all of a piece, and contacts with other persons real and enriching, could build up the person as nothing else could. From this point of view, school camps, residential schools for periods of six months to a year, residential County Colleges and Adult Colleges, are to be encouraged in every way—provided they are based on a sound philosophy.

The 1944 Education Act establishes the principle that young people are to be under educational guidance after they finish whole-time schooling, ultimately, we hope, until eighteen. A most difficult and important problem is the application of this educational oversight in the field of daily work. Some interesting experimental approaches are being made, such as local talks between business men and L.E.A.s; local committees of educationalists, employers, and trade unionists under the Director of Education; a system of tutors to advise and befriend small groups of adolescents, experimental factory schools run with the help of the L.E.A. With regard to the actual choice of jobs, the Juvenile Employment Service is developing its educational function. In 1944 an official pamphlet, *The Young Worker,* set out plainly that the duty of Juvenile Advisory

Committees and Employment Officers was "primarily to the boy or girl", and claimed that "the services which help boys and girls to choose a suitable career . . . and which watch over their interests as workers are . . . contributions towards solving the one problem which is to give the adolescent the best chance to grow into a happy and useful man or woman". Since then the implementing of the Ince Report has meant that a great many local education authorities have taken over this 'branch of education' from the Ministry of Labour, in addition to those already controlling it. This development offers great opportunity for linking the Service of Youth to Juvenile Employment and building up one department of education in which young people can be dealt with in their wholeness. Obviously the quality of Juvenile Employment Officers is of crucial importance, while their value as guides to the young depends also on the extent to which they can be set free from excessive red-tape and form-filling. There is a case here for much exciting experiment in what is emphatically a field of education. As always, we shall probably work out an organisation with much local variation of pattern.

The fact remains, however, that so far we have not grasped the full significance of this entry into work as a vital stage in education. We need close links between County Colleges and local industries, experimental training schemes within industries, and much thought on how to integrate technical and cultural education. Above all, we must discover ways of showing the young worker the social purpose of his job, and its full, world-wide ramifications. War-time experiments in appealing to workers as responsible beings must be developed, not to feed a war-time machine, but as a proper part of the young worker's education. The Church has a hard job of thinking to do on the Christian meaning of daily work in an industrial society. The issue of monotonous work for the adolescent must be properly faced. Possibly we ought to seek legislation

scheduling certain types of work as unfit for those under eighteen. Dead-end jobs, with no training, must be abolished. Finally, we cannot tackle this aspect of education without asking: for whom do we ask the young to work —their fellows, or a small favoured class? Work as a form of social education is inextricably bound up with the economic structure of society.

The rapid growth of clubs and youth organisations shows clearly what a hiatus was here to be filled. In expanding the Service of Youth we must not forget that its real significance lies, not in wonderful buildings or lavish equipment, but in fostering societies of persons in which individuals can grow to full stature. We need groups of all kinds, high-brow and low-brow, organised and unorganised, mixed in sex and separate. Some young people simply need a place in which to meet; it would be admirable if adults would open their houses to small groups of such, especially in the country where clubs are difficult. One informal group meets every Saturday afternoon in a gramophone shop to play records: what they need is 'a room of their own'. Clubs obviously have many aims, but we are stressing here the primary function of fostering the growth of persons through personal and social relations; this is the point to be made when objection is raised to 'spending public money on dancing' and other (so-called) non-educational activities. Let us think in terms of clubs not too large to be true societies, or, if we must have a huge organisation, let it be one that easily falls into real social groups. A good pattern is that of one thoroughly well-equipped Youth Centre (with hall, stage, gymnasium, swimming-bath, library, chapel, etc.) for a town or district, with clubs and organisations of all types and sizes grouped around it, all free to enjoy its facilities. There will, of course, be many local patterns; what we must avoid at all costs are large Palaces of Youth, where the young

gather to be amused with little more effort than in commercial places of amusement.

The other crucial question in the Service of Youth is that of leadership. We need people of the same quality as in teaching, and mostly from the twenty to thirty-five age-group, since they have to pass on to the adolescent the experience of adults who have fairly recently gone through the same stages. An essential feature of their leadership should be its informality and sympathy, for they must be the bridge between youth and the adult community. They need to be trained and backed by widely experienced adults, and it must be easy for them to pass from youth leadership into middle-aged jobs. For this work of leadership the Church must be prepared to send forth into so-called 'secular' clubs some of her best people, even, maybe, at the expense of her own internal organisation. We want some of the most alive and most 'committed' of the young-adult generation for this work.

A proper entry into citizenship and training in the conduct of public affairs are aspects of education on which experimental work is needed. Training in the techniques of co-operation must go on continuously through working in groups for common ends, learning committee procedure, assuming office and leadership, drawing up constitutions, administering discipline. For a more conscious understanding of the community we have stressed local surveys, the history of methods of government, and the study of reforming movements. Paths from the local community lead outwards to the ends of the earth: thus the child learns local, national and international obligation. A focal point in education for citizenship should be the new type of history and geography discussed earlier. Broadcasts can assist greatly here, with dramatic representations of methods of government and so forth. Preparation for direct participation in public affairs must be many-sided:

critical discussion in clubs and colleges; work of service to the community, local and perhaps national too; where appropriate, intelligent entry into trade union membership and political parties; the proper presentation of the views of young people to public authorities. Organised Service Squads and Councils of Youth are recent experiments of real significance. Councils of Youth should be properly elected and representative local bodies of young people, officially recognised by the local authority. Much thought needs to be given to the question of how to use them to the full to develop the judgment and responsibility of young citizens. The educational function of the compulsory period of national service needs to be thought out.

We cannot bring up the young properly without a live adult society into which to introduce them, and this liveness is very largely to be tested by the variety and spontaneity of its groupings.

> "We need small units, scaled to direct activity and participation in every phase of organisation . . . units in which intelligent and co-operative behaviour can take the place of mass regulations, mass decisions, mass actions, imposed by ever remoter leaders and administrators. Small groups: small classes: small communities: institutions framed to the human scale are essential to purposive behaviour in modern society." (Mumford, *op. cit.* p. 475.)

> "Our problem . . . is simple to state. It is to find democratic ways of living for little men in big societies. For men are little, and their capacity cannot transcend their experience. . . . They can control great affairs only by acting together in the control of small affairs. . . . Democracy can work in the great State . . . only if each State is made up of a host of little democracies, and rests

finally, not on isolated individuals, but on groups small enough to express the spirit of neighbourhood and personal acquaintance." (G. D. H. Cole, *Supplement to Christian News-Letter No.* 90.)

As an essential part of our educational programme we have to re-create the pattern of adult life in terms of small groups, by fostering all the tiny seedlings of corporate activity which sprang up in war-time soil, and by watering older plants—Women's Institutes, local political parties, W.E.A. classes, and voluntary societies of all kinds, from Pigeon Fanciers to Amateur Operatics. The crying need in most places is for a hall or room in which to be a society, and this question of meeting-places has now to be vigorously tackled, as derequisitioned huts become available. It is most encouraging to find the Ministry of Education taking such activities under its wing, by recognising Community Centres as educational instruments of great future significance, in which men and women may find themselves through social living, and by setting out plans for aiding local initiative in building up such centres.[1] Here is a great work to be done, provided we keep in mind the two chief dangers which beset Community Centres—artificiality and class-division. The Centre must be a real focal point for a truly mixed society, embodying the locality in wholeness.

Some adult groups should be directly charged to implement the educational responsibilities of the community, whether through unofficial means, like Educational Councils of Action, or through official committees of many kinds under the L.E.A. These need to be increasingly lively and important. The adult population of a locality needs to develop a new sense of educational responsibility for the cinema. The trouble is that this is not a local institution but a vast commercial monopoly beyond local control. Yet

[1] *Community Centres*, H.M.S.O., 1945.

it is one of the most powerful forms of education. If the general community takes its responsibility seriously, there must be councils, local and national, to watch over programmes and make positive educational suggestions. Nationally, this direction already exists in some measure, but the crucial point is whether ordinary citizens in a local community can be got to discipline their own tastes for the sake of the young. Another suggestion is that towns should set up Three Arts Committees for the direction of Music, Art and Drama. One significant war-time development was the making of toys by older members of the community for younger. This was done by Senior Schools, by N.F.S. units, A.R.P. posts and many other groups. To watch a fireman putting the finishing touches to his model train is to realise that these efforts have a value far beyond that of the toys themselves, especially where the grown-ups take their toys to the centre and watch how they are used. Thus in many varied ways the community must seek to fulfil its educative function.

What should be the relation of youth clubs to adult societies? Should they be placed, for instance, in community-centre buildings alongside adult clubs, and should joint activities be encouraged? Opinions vary considerably, and judgments in local situations may well differ. The important thing is not to 'departmentalise' youth too much, but, whilst providing for its peculiar needs, to make its transit to the adult community easy and natural. Therefore the soundest principle seems to be that of separate youth activities within the Community Centre setting. Extreme impatience of the under-twenties with anybody over twenty-five is surely a sign of a bad rift. A most interesting attempt to avoid this artificial split into age-groups is seen in the 'family clubs', notably the Peckham Health Centre. This insistence on the family unit as the basis of other societies needs to be considered by churches and other social organisations planning full weekly pro-

grammes in terms of different age-groups. How many churches allow one night in the week when *the whole family* can come together to a social gathering, or, alternatively, when the whole family can sit together round its own fireside without some member feeling he ought to be out?

The Church's unique task is to bring the young within the life of the community of God. This seems so difficult that it often tends to be replaced by lesser objectives. We must re-focus attention on this specific educational task of training in the tradition of churchmanship held by the worshipping community. This can only be done *from inside* the particular manifestation of the Church Universal. In carrying it out we must think always in terms of *groups* growing together through a variety of activities and summing up their fellowship in common worship. Most important of all, we must link children's and young people's organisations to the all-age community of the Church itself, for they are all really bits of the Church and training-grounds for full church-membership. We can only see their full significance when we view them thus. A most pressing problem, therefore, is how to break away from the conception of the Sunday School as a place which keeps the children quiet and teaches them some Bible stories. We must work out its activities in terms of a Junior Church at worship rather than a school at lessons, we must balance the full junior church by the full adult church and we must link the two much more closely together. The transition from 'junior' to 'adult' church needs much thought if we are to break the habit of a church-leaving age coinciding with school-leaving age. Perhaps the best strategy is not to concentrate so much on the Sunday Schools and youth organisations as such, but on *families,* and especially on young parents. For, educationally speaking, families are the real bricks of the Church, and even if we have only few of these they are

still our best building materials. To bring up the young within the community of the Church, we have to revive its activities as a true social fellowship, find opportunities for the young to lead in a variety of ways, and give them a graded training in responsibility.

But there are wider aspects of the Church's tasks. The local manifestation must be set within the pattern of the Church Universal. Can we make the Church 'come alive' in the imagination—the miraculous fact of its presence in human history, its expansion, its world-wide position today, its transcendence of human barriers? Surely we can if we quarry boldly enough in the astounding mines of Church history, and then use every modern medium of drama, film, and so forth, to present the great panorama of the kingdom that fails not, from the days of a handful of Palestinians travelling on Roman roads, or those when Christianity was going east to China and west to Britain, right down to these present days when missionaries go forth throughout the world by aeroplane, when the Church in occupied Europe recently faced new persecutions, and Christians maintained their fellowship across the barriers of war. But the full richness of the Church Universal becomes known to those who, being first grounded in their own tradition of churchmanship, discover beyond this the astonishing fertility of the Holy Spirit at work in manifold forms, and the unity in diversity of the Body of Christ.

The Church has her unique educational task, but, if religious education means imbibing values implicit in common life, she is concerned in the whole range of social living, and if the most vital element in education is to bring the young into living contact with persons of coherent and strong faith, then the Church should be seeking to find these teachers for the community. She must put the vocation of the teacher and youth leader before Christians as urgent and vital work. In many ways the fields

of 'secular' youth work are white to harvest, and the Church must send forth workers, both leaders and young people themselves as members, not in a spirit of superiority, but as those who will meet their fellows frankly and freely. It is the Church's job, not to press the claims of pious duties inside as against those of secular responsibility outside, but to teach the young that all service can be for God, and to train them to make their own Christian decisions on the use of time, money, energy, etc. Thus we may recover the full force of a Christian laity in the life of the community. If, in one sense, the Church calls its members forth from the world, in another sense it must not separate them from the hurly-burly of other societies, for, on the one hand, they need to rub shoulders in the local community and, on the other, the salt of Christian moral judgment is necessary inside every group of human beings.

All through community education that note must be struck which makes the other side of the paradox—the need for the quality of solitariness. We must keep this note sounding steadily throughout our education. There must be provision for solitary pursuits and for the odd or different individual. We must respect aloofness and never assume that all the young ought to join organisations or follow an approved pattern. We must give freedom to minority views and find a place for the prophet crying in the wilderness who disturbs our complacency so profoundly. Most difficult of all, we must seek to give every growing person power to enjoy quietness and solitude. This is closely connected with the capacity for wonder and contemplation, and stands in antithesis to the power of analysing and understanding with the mind. Even whilst we teach the child, as for instance through the natural sciences, to analyse, to understand, to use, things in his environment, let us make room for the silent outgoing of spirit in sheer wonder at the beauty of something (whether

an insect under the microscope or a great work of art) which he can never wholly understand or possess or exploit, but must simply enjoy, standing in awe and humility before it.

Lastly, we must take one more look at the most fundamental question of all. Can we really attempt a true community education at all when our society is so lacking in common basic values, when, in fact, we do not know where we are going as a nation? Can we eliminate a conflict of values in the upbringing of the young? The Christian answer must be: not entirely, for the fact of sin makes conflict inevitable. But although we may not expect a Utopia, we clearly have the duty to build, as far as possible, a harmonious and coherent social experience which nurtures the young in security. Our greatest task, therefore, is to find again our common values in society and give them living expression. Can we seek *any* harmony of values in a society which is only semi-Christian? It is the writer's belief that there is still enough common ground between Christians and others, especially so-called 'humanists', for the re-creation of basic values which run right through social experience. These may be summarised in the form of certain fundamental experiences which our society must give all its members:

1. The experience of comprehending the natural world as a universe of law and order which is 'given' to man and upon which he is dependent.
2. The experience of living in human societies which seek to express in their own life this same principle of reliable order and consistent law administered by trustworthy authority.
3. The experience of true personal relations, of loving and being loved, and of working in groups which give direct contact of person with person, rather than in masses.
4. The experience of understanding and embracing

one's daily work as a significant and worthy service to the community.

5. The experience of understanding that to which one belongs, and of entering into clear-sighted, critical membership.

6. The experience of being challenged to serve worthy purposes greater than oneself.

7. The experience of withdrawal into solitude.

Our task is very great, for we have to build these experiences, not simply into home, school and church, but into the whole social fabric. Nothing short of the re-creation of our social order will suffice for the true upbringing of our children.

Living in community ought to be the most complete form of education. The whole idea of the city—before it became associated with machines and slums—embodied a noble view of man's upbringing in society. The Elizabethan Londoner, John Stow, saw this and wrote:

"Men are congregated into cities and commonwealths for honesty and utility's sake, these shortly be the commodities that do come by cities, commonalties and corporations. First, men by this nearness of conversation are withdrawn from barbarous feritie and force, to certain mildness of manners, and to humanity and justice, whereby they are contented to give and take right, to and from their equals and inferiors, and to hear and obey their heads and superiors. Also the doctrine of God is more fitly delivered, and the discipline thereof more aptly to be executed, in peopled towns than abroad, by reason of the facility of common and often assembling . . . Good behaviour is yet called *urbanitas* because it is rather found in cities than elsewhere. . . .

"And whereas commonwealths and kingdoms cannot have, next after God, any surer foundation than the love

city. heavenly city. heavenly city. heavenly

heavenly. heavenly. heavenly.